arXiv:math/0504376v2 [math.AG] 23 Apr 2005

RIGIDITY OF MORPHISMS FOR LOG SCHEMES

ATSUSHI MORIWAKI

Abstract. In this paper, we give the rigidity theorem for a log morphism as an extension of a fixed scheme morphism. We also give several applications of the rigidity theorem.

Contents

Introduction 1
1. Semistable schemes over a scheme 5
2. Preliminaries to log schemes 14
3. Rigidity theorem 26
4. Descent of log morphisms 32
5. Dualizing sheaves of log semistable schemes 38
6. Extension of log morphisms 45
7. Semistable schemes of log canonical type 54
References 61

Introduction

In the paper [6], we proved Kato's conjecture, that is, the finiteness of dominant rational maps in the category of log schemes as a generalization of Kobayashi-Ochiai theorem. It guarantees the finiteness of K-rational points of a certain kind of log smooth schemes for a big function field K, which gives rise to an evidence for Lang's conjecture. In the proof of the above theorem, the most essential part is the rigidity theorem of log morphisms. In this paper, we would like to generalize it to a semistable scheme over an arbitrary noetherian scheme.

Let $f : X \to S$ be a scheme of finite type over a locally noetherian scheme S. We assume that $f : X \to S$ is a semistable scheme over S, that is, f is flat and, for any morphism $\operatorname{Spec}(\Omega) \to S$ with Ω an algebraic closed field, the completion of the local ring of $X \times_S \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega)$ at every closed point is isomorphic to a ring of the type

$$\Omega[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X_1 \cdots X_l).$$

Let $g : Y \to S$ be another semistable scheme over S, and let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a morphism over S. Let M_X, M_Y and M_S be fine log structures on X, Y and S respectively. We assume that (X, M_X) and (Y, M_Y) are log smooth and integral over (S, M_S) and ϕ is admissible with respect to M_Y/M_S, that is, for all $s \in S$ and any irreducible components V of the geometric fiber $X_{\bar{s}}$ over s,

$$\phi_{\bar{s}}(V) \not\subseteq \operatorname{Supp}(M_{Y_{\bar{s}}}/M_{\bar{s}}),$$

Date: 22/April/2005, 17:00(JP), (Version 1.01).

where $M_{Y_{\bar{s}}} = M_Y|_{Y_{\bar{s}}}$, $M_{\bar{s}} = M_S|_{\bar{s}}$ and

$$\operatorname{Supp}(M_{Y_{\bar{s}}}/M_{\bar{s}}) = \{y \in Y_{\bar{s}} \mid M_{\bar{s}} \times \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\times} \to M_{Y_{\bar{s}},\bar{y}} \text{ is not surjective}\}.$$

Then, the following theorem is one of the main results of this paper.

Theorem A (Rigidity theorem)**.** *If we have log morphisms*

$$(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y) \quad \textit{and} \quad (\phi, h') : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

over (S, M_S) *as extensions of* $\phi : X \to Y$*, then* $h = h'$*.*

As corollary of the rigidity theorem, we have the following descent theorem for log morphisms:

Theorem B. (1) (Descent for a faithfully flat base change) *Let* $\pi : S' \to S$ *be a faithfully flat and quasi-compact morphism of locally noetherian schemes. Let* $X' = X \times_S S'$*,* $Y' = Y \times_S S'$ *and* $\phi' = \phi \times_S \mathrm{id}_{S'}$*, and let us set the induced morphisms as follows:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[d, "f"'] & X' \arrow[l, "\pi_X"'] \arrow[d, "f'"] \\ S & S' \arrow[l, "\pi"'] \end{tikzcd} \qquad \begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[d, "g"'] & Y' \arrow[l, "\pi_Y"'] \arrow[d, "g'"] \\ S & S' \arrow[l, "\pi"'] \end{tikzcd}$$

If there is a log morphism

$$(\phi', h') : (X', \pi_X^*(M_X)) \to (Y', \pi_Y^*(M_Y))$$

over $(S', \pi^*(M_S))$*, then it descends to a log morphism*

$$(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

over (S, M_S)*.*

(2) (Descent for the smooth topology) *Let*

$$\{\pi_i : X_i \to X\}_{i \in I} \quad \textit{and} \quad \{\mu_j : Y_j \to Y\}_{j \in J}$$

be families of smooth morphisms such that $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} \pi_i(X_i)$ *and* $Y = \bigcup_{j \in J} \mu_j(Y_j)$*. We assume that, for each* $i \in I$*, there are* $j \in J$ *and a morphism* $\phi_i : X_i \to Y_j$ *such that the diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_i \arrow[r, "\phi_i"] \arrow[d, "\pi_i"'] & Y_j \arrow[d, "\mu_j"] \\ X \arrow[r, "\phi"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative and ϕ_i *extends to a log morphism*

$$(\phi_i, h_i) : (X_i, \pi_i^*(M_X)) \to (Y_j, \mu_j^*(M_Y)).$$

Then, there is a log morphism

$$(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

as an extension of $\phi : X \to Y$ *with the following diagram commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} (X_i, \pi_i^*(M_X)) \arrow[r, "(\phi_i, h_i)"] \arrow[d, "(\pi_i, \mathrm{nat})"'] & (Y_j, \mu_j^*(M_Y)) \arrow[d, "(\mu_j, \mathrm{nat})"] \\ (X, M_X) \arrow[r, "(\phi, h)"] & (Y, M_Y), \end{tikzcd}$$

where nat *is the natural homomorphism.*

For the proofs of Theorem A and Theorem B, our starting point is the following local structure theorem, which asserts the local description of integral and smooth log morphisms of semistable schemes.

Theorem C (Local structure theorem)**.** *Let* $(f,h) : (X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$ *be a smooth and integral morphism of fine log schemes. Let* x *be an element of* X *and* $s = f(x)$*. We assume that* $f : X \to S$ *is semistable at* x*, i.e.,* f *is flat at* x *and, for any morphism* $\eta : \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega) \to S$ *with* Ω *an algebraic closed field and* $\eta(0) = s$*, the completion of the local ring of* $X \times_S \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega)$ *at every closed point lying over* x *is isomorphic to a ring of the type*

$$\Omega[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X_1 \cdots X_l).$$

Then, we have the following for each case:

I. *If* f *is smooth at* x*, then* $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}} \simeq \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \times \mathbb{N}^a$ *for some non-negative integer* a*.*

II. *If* f *is not smooth at* x *and* $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}} : \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ *splits, then* $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}} \simeq \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \times N$*, where* N *is the monoid arising from monomials of*

$$\mathbb{Z}[U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_a]/(U_1^2 - U_2^2)$$

for some $a \geq 2$*.*

III. *If* f *is not smooth at* x *and* $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}} : \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ *does not split, then* $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ *has the unique semistable structure* (σ, q_0, Δ, B) *over* $\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ *for some* $\sigma \subseteq \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ *with* $\#(\sigma) \geq 2$*,* $q_0 \in \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ *and* $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$*.*

Based on the local structure theorem, the proof of the rigidity theorem is carried out as follows: Clearly we may assume that $S = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ for some noetherian local ring (A, m). First, we establish the theorem in the case where A is an algebraically closed field. This was proved actually in the previous paper [6]. Next, by induction on n, we see that the assertion holds for the case $S = \operatorname{Spec}(A/m^n)$. Finally, using the Krull intersection theorem, we can conclude its proof. As an application, we give a criterion for the extension of a scheme morphism to the log morphism (cf. Theorem 6.1). Besides them, we show the following extension problem of automorphisms to the central fiber, which is a generalization of the result in [4].

Theorem D. *Let* (A, tA) *be a discrete valuation ring. Let* $f : X \to \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ *and* $f' : X' \to \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ *be proper and generically smooth semistable schemes over* $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$*, and let* B *and* B' *be horizontal effective Cartier divisors on* X *and* X' *respectively. Let* $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ *be a birational map over* $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$ *such that it is an isomorphism on the generic fibers* X_η *and* X'_η *and that* $\phi_\eta^*(B'_\eta) = B_\eta$*. We assume that* (X, B) *and* (X', B') *are of log canonical type* (*for the definition of log canonical type, see* §§7.2) *and that* $\omega_{X/A} + B$ *and* $\omega_{X'/A} + B'$ *are ample with respect to* f *and* f'*. Then* ϕ *extends to an isomorphism.*

In §1, we give the definition of semistable schemes and show their several properties. In §2, we recall several facts concerning log schemes and prove the local structure theorem. §3 contains the proof of the rigidity theorem. In §4, we consider a descent problem for log schemes. §5 contains the explicit form of the determinant of the sheaf of log 1-forms. In §6, we consider a criterion for the extension of a scheme morphism to the log morphism. Finally, in §7, the extension problem of automorphisms to the central fiber are considered.

Conventions and terminology. Here we will fix several conventions and terminology for this paper.

1. Throughout this paper, a ring means a commutative ring with the unity.

2. In this paper, the logarithmic structures of schemes means the sense of J.-M Fontaine, L. Illusie, and K. Kato. For the details, we refer to [5]. For a log structure M_X on a scheme X, we denote the quotient $M_X/\mathcal{O}_X^{\times}$ by $\overline{M}_X$.

3. Let X be a scheme and F a sheaf in the étale topology. For a point $x \in X$, the germ of F at x with respect to the Zariski topology (resp. the étale topology) is denoted by F_x (resp. $F_{\bar{x}}$).

4. Throughout this paper, a monoid is a commutative monoid with the unity. The binary operation of a monoid is often written additively. We say a monoid P is *finitely generated* if there are $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ such that $P = \mathbb{N}p_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{N}p_r$. Moreover, P is said to be *integral* if $x + z = y + z$ for $x, y, z \in P$, then $x = y$. An integral and finitely generated monoid is said to be *fine*. We say P is *sharp* if $x + y = 0$ for $x, y \in P$, then $x = y = 0$. For a sharp monoid P, an element x of P is said to be *irreducible* if $x = y + z$ for $y, z \in P$, then either $y = 0$ or $z = 0$. A homomorphism $f : Q \to P$ of monoids is said to be *integral* if $f(q) + p = f(q') + p'$ for $p, p' \in P$ and $q, q' \in Q$, then there are $q_1, q_2 \in Q$ and $p'' \in P$ such that $q + q_1 = q' + q_2$, $p = f(q_1) + p''$ and $p' = f(q_2) + p''$. Note that an integral homomorphism of sharp monoids is injective. Moreover, we say an injective homomorphism $f : Q \to P$ *splits* if there is a submonoid N of P with $P = f(Q) \times N$.

5. Let X be a set. We denote the set of all maps $X \to \mathbb{N}$ by $\mathbb{N}^X$. For $T \in \mathbb{N}^X$, $\operatorname{Supp}(T)$ is given by $\{x \in X \mid T(x) > 0\}$. Moreover, for $T, T' \in \mathbb{N}^X$,

$$T \leq T' \overset{\text{def}}{\iff} T(x) \leq T'(x) \ \forall x \in X.$$

In the case where $X = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\mathbb{N}^X$ is sometimes denoted by $\mathbb{N}^n$.

6. Let M be a monoid, X a finite subset of M and $T \in \mathbb{N}^X$. For simplicity, $\sum_{x \in X} T(x)x$ is often denoted by $T \cdot X$. If we use the product symbol for the binary operation of the monoid M, then $\prod_{x \in X} x^{T(x)}$ is written by X^T. Moreover, if $X = \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ and $I \in \mathbb{N}^n$, then $I \cdot X$ and X^I means $\sum_{i=1}^n I(i)X_i$ and $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{I(i)}$ respectively according to a way of the binary operator of M.

7. Let A be a ring and R be either the ring of polynomials of n-variables over A, or the ring of formal power series of n-variables over A, that is, $R = A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ or $A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. For $I \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we denote the monomial $X_1^{I(1)} \cdots X_n^{I(n)}$ by X^I.

8. Let (A, m) be a local ring. The henselization of A and the completion of A with respect to m are denoted by A^h and $\widehat{A}$ respectively.

1. Semistable schemes over a scheme

1.1. **Algebraic preliminaries.**

Here we consider several lemmas which will be used later. Let us begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 1.1.1. *Let $f : (A, m_A) \to (B, m_B)$ be a local homomorphism of noetherian local rings such that f induces an isomorphism $A/m_A \xrightarrow{\sim} B/m_B$.*

(1) *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be generator of m_B, that is, $m_B = Bx_1 + \cdots + Bx_n$. If (B, m_B) is complete, then*

$$B = \sum_{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0} f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}.$$

(2) *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be elements of m_B with $m_B = Bx_1 + \cdots + Bx_n + m_A B$. If (A, m_A) and (B, m_B) are complete, then*

$$B = \sum_{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0} f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}.$$

Proof. (1) First, we claim the following:

Claim 1.1.1.1.

$$m_B^d \subseteq \sum_{\substack{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0 \\ a_1 + \cdots + a_n = d}} f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} + m_B^{d+1}$$

for all $d \geq 0$.

We prove this claim by induction on d. Since $A/m_A \simeq B/m_B$, we have $B = f(A) + m_B$, which means that the assertion holds for $d = 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} m_B &= (f(A) + m_B)x_1 + \cdots + (f(A) + m_B)x_n \\ &\subseteq f(A)x_1 + \cdots + f(A)x_n + m_B^2, \end{aligned}$$

which show that the assertion holds for $d = 1$, so that we assume $d \geq 2$. By the hypothesis of induction,

$$\begin{aligned} m_B^d &= m_B \cdot m_B^{d-1} \\ &\subseteq \left(f(A)x_1 + \cdots + f(A)x_n + m_B^2\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{a'_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a'_n \geq 0 \\ a'_1 + \cdots + a'_n = d-1}} f(A) x_1^{a'_1} \cdots x_n^{a'_n} + m_B^d \right) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{\substack{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0 \\ a_1 + \cdots + a_n = d}} f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} + m_B^{d+1} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get the claim.

In order to complete the proof of the lemma, it is sufficient to see the following claim:

Claim 1.1.1.2. *For all $b \in B$, there is a sequence $\{b_d\}_{d=0}^{\infty}$ of B such that*

$$b_d \in \sum_{\substack{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0 \\ a_1 + \cdots + a_n = d}} f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}$$

and

$$b - (b_0 + \cdots + b_d) \in m_B^{d+1}$$

for all $d \geq 0$.

Since $B = f(A) + m_B$, we can set $b = b_0 + c$ with $b_0 \in f(A)$ and $c \in m_B$. We assume that $b_0, \ldots, b_{d-1}$ are given. Then, by Claim 1.1.1.1 again,

$$b - (b_0 + \cdots + b_{d-1}) = b_d + c',$$

where $b_d \in \sum_{\substack{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0 \\ a_1 + \cdots + a_n = d}} f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}$ and $c' \in m_B^{d+1}$. Therefore, we get the second claim.

(2) Let us choose $y_1, \ldots, y_r \in A$ with $m_A = y_1 A + \cdots + y_r A$. Then,

$$m_B = x_1 B + \cdots + x_n B + f(y_1) B + \cdots + f(y_r) B.$$

Note that

$$x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} f(y_1)^{b_1} \cdots f(y_d)^{b_r} = f(y_1^{b_1} \cdots y_y^{b_r}) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}.$$

Therefore, since (A, m_A) is complete,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0 \\ b_1 \geq 0, \ldots, b_r \geq 0}} & f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} f(y_1)^{b_1} \cdots f(y_d)^{b_r} \\ &= \sum_{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0} \left(\sum_{b_1 \geq 0, \ldots, b_r \geq 0} f(A y_1^{b_1} \cdots y_y^{b_r}) \right) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} \\ &= \sum_{a_1 \geq 0, \ldots, a_n \geq 0} f(A) x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (2) is a consequence of (1). □

Next let us consider the following lemma.

Lemma 1.1.2. *Let* (A, m) *be a noetherian local ring and* $T \in \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}$*. Let* $G \in m[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$*,* $R = A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X^T - G)$ *and* $\pi : A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!] \to R$ *the canonical homomorphism. Then, we have the following:*

(1) *Let* M *be an* A*-submodule of* $A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ *given by*

$$M = \left\{ \sum_{T \not\leq I} a_I X^I \mid a_I \in A \right\}.$$

If (A, m) *is complete, then* $\pi|_M : M \to R$ *is bijective.*

(2) $A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X^T - G)$ *is flat over* A*.*

Proof. (1) We denote $\pi(X_i)$ by x_i. First, we claim the following:

Claim 1.1.2.1. *For* $f \in R$*, there is a sequence* $\{F_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ *in* M *such that* $F_{n+1} - F_n \in m^n[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ *and* $f - \pi(F_n) \in m^n R$ *for all* n*.*

We will construct a sequence $\{F_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ inductively. Clearly, we may set $F_0 = 0$. We assume that $F_0, F_1, \ldots, F_n$ have been constructed. Then, we can set $f - \pi(F_n) = \pi(H) + x^T \pi(H')$ for some $H, H' \in m^n[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ with $H \in M$. Here, $x^T \pi(H') = \pi(G)\pi(H') \in m^{n+1} R$. Thus, if we set $F_{n+1} = F_n + H$, then we get our desired F_{n+1}.

The above claim shows that $\pi|_M$ is surjective. Next, let us consider the injectivity of $\pi|_M$. We assume

$$\pi\left(\sum_{T \not\leq I} a_I X^I\right) = 0.$$

Then, there is $H \in A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ with

$$\sum_{T \not\leq I} a_I X^I = (X^T - G)H.$$

Here we set

$$G = \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}^n} g_I X^I \quad \text{and} \quad H = \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}^n} h_I X^I.$$

Then, $g_I \in m$ for all I and

$$\sum_{T \not\leq I} a_I X^I = \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}^n} h_I X^{T+I} - \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}^n}\left(\sum_{J+J'=I} g_J h_{J'}\right) X^I.$$

On the left hand side of the above equation, there is no term of a form X^{I+T}. Thus,

$$h_I = \sum_{J+J'=I+T} g_J h_{J'}$$

for all I. Here we claim that $h_I \in m^n$ for all n and all I. We see this fact by induction n. First of all, since $g_I \in m$ for all I, we have $h_I \in m$ for all I. We assume that $h_I \in m^n$ for all I. Then, by the above equation, we can see that $h_I \in m^{n+1}$. By this claim, h_I must be zero for all I because $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} m^n = 0$. Therefore, $a_I = 0$ for all I.

(2) If (A, m) is complete, then the assertion follows from (1) by Chase's theorem [2]. In general, let $\widehat{A}$ be the completion of A and

$$R' = \widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X^T - G).$$

Then, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
R \arrow[r, "h'"] & R' \\
A \arrow[u, "f"] \arrow[r, "h"] & \widehat{A}. \arrow[u, "f'"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that f', h and h' are faithfully flat. Thus, so is f. □

Remark 1.1.3. Let A be a ring and $A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ the polynomial ring of n-variables over A. Then, in the same way as in Lemma 1.1.2, we can see that $R = A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(X^T - a)$ is flat over A for $T \in \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}$ and $a \in A$. Indeed, if we set

$$M = \left\{\sum_{T \not\leq I} a_I X^I \in A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]\right\},$$

then the natural homomorphism $\pi : M \to R$ is bijective. The surjectivity of π is obvious. We assume that an element $\sum a_I X^I$ of M is zero in R. Then,

$$\sum a_I X^I = (X^T - a)\sum_J b_J X^J$$

for some $\sum_J b_J X^J \in A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. Thus, $b_J = ab_{J+T}$ for all J. Therefore, $b_J = a^m b_{J+mT}$ for all $m > 0$. On the other hand, since $\sum_J b_J X^J \in A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$, $b_{J+mT} = 0$ if $m \gg 0$. Hence $b_J = 0$ for all J.

Here we consider an approximation by an étale neighborhood.

Proposition 1.1.4. *Let (A, m_A) be a noetherian local ring essentially of finite type over an excellent discrete valuation ring or a field. Let $f : X \to \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ be a scheme of finite type over A. Let x be a point of X such that $f(x) = m_A$ and A/m_A is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}/m_{X,x}$. We assume that there are $F_1, \ldots, F_r \in A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ (the polynomial ring of n-variables over A) and an isomorphism*

$$\phi : \widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(F_1, \ldots, F_r) \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$$

over $\widehat{A}$ with $\phi(\bar{X}_i) \in \widehat{m}_{X,x}$ for all i, where $\bar{X}_i = X_i \mod (F_1, \ldots, F_r)$. Then, there is an étale neighborhood (U, x') of X at x together with an étale morphism

$$\rho : U \to \operatorname{Spec}(A[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(F_1(T), \ldots, F_r(T)))$$

such that $\rho(x') = (m_A, \bar{T}_1, \ldots, \bar{T}_n)$, where $\bar{T}_i = T_i \mod (F_1(T), \ldots, F_r(T))$.

Proof. First note that

$$F_1(\phi(\bar{X}_1), \ldots, \phi(\bar{X}_n)) = \cdots = F_r(\phi(\bar{X}_1), \ldots, \phi(\bar{X}_n)) = 0.$$

Thus, by Artin's approximation theorem [1], there are $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathcal{O}^h_{X,x}$ such that

$$F_1(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = \cdots = F_r(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = 0$$

and $t_i - \phi(\bar{X}_i) \in \widehat{m}^2_{X,x}$ for all i. Here we claim the following:

Claim 1.1.4.1.

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{m}_{X,x} &= \phi(\bar{X}_1)\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + \cdots + \phi(\bar{X}_n)\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + m_A\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} \\ &= t_1\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + \cdots + t_n\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + m_A\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$\widehat{m}_{X,x} \supseteq \phi(\bar{X}_1)\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + \cdots + \phi(\bar{X}_n)\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + m_A\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}.$$

Conversely, let us pick up $f \in \widehat{m}_{X,x}$. Then, we can write $f = \sum_I a_I \bar{X}^I$. If $a_{(0,\ldots,0)} \in \widehat{A}^{\times}$, then f must be a unit because $f \in a_{(0,\ldots,0)} + \widehat{m}_{X,x}$. This is a contradiction. Thus, $a_{(0,\ldots,0)} \in m_A$, which means that

$$f \in \phi(\bar{X}_1)\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + \cdots + \phi(\bar{X}_n)\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + m_A\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}.$$

Since $t_i - \phi(\bar{X}_i) \in \widehat{m}^2_{X,x}$, we can see that

$$\widehat{m}_{X,x} = t_1\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + \cdots + t_n\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + m_A\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} + \widehat{m}^2_{X,x}.$$

Hence, by Nakayama's lemma, we have our desired result.

Let us choose an étale neighborhood (U, x') of X at x with the same residue fields such that $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are defined over U. Here let us define a homomorphism

$$\psi : A[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(F_1(T), \ldots, F_r(T)) \to \mathcal{O}_{U,x'}$$

to be $\psi(\bar{T}_i) = t_i$ for all i. By the above claim, we can see

$$\psi^{-1}(m_{U,x'}) = (m_A, \bar{T}_1, \ldots, \bar{T}_n).$$

Thus, it is sufficient to show that ψ is étale. Let

$$\mu : \widehat{A}[\![T_1, \ldots, T_n]\!]/(F_1, \ldots, F_r) \to \widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(F_1, \ldots, F_r)$$

be a homomorphism given by the composition of homomorphisms

$$\widehat{A}[\![T_1,\dots,T_n]\!]/(F_1,\dots,F_r) \xrightarrow{\widehat{\psi}} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{U,x'} = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} \xrightarrow{\phi^{-1}} \widehat{A}[\![X_1,\dots,X_n]\!]/(F_1,\dots,F_r).$$

By the above claim and Lemma 1.1.1, μ is surjective. Hence, by the following Lemma 1.1.5, it must be an isomorphism. Therefore, so is $\widehat{\psi}$. This means that ψ is étale because x' and $(m_A, \bar{T}_1,\dots,\bar{T}_n)$ have the same residue field. □

Finally, we consider the following two lemmas concerning the bijectivity of ring homomorphisms.

Lemma 1.1.5. *Let $\phi : A \to A$ be an endomorphism of a noetherian ring. If ϕ is surjective, then ϕ is injective.*

Proof. We set $I_n = \operatorname{Ker}(\phi^n)$ for $n \geq 1$. Since ϕ is surjective, we can see that $\phi(I_{n+1}) = I_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. Moreover, there is $N \geq 1$ such that $I_{N+1} = I_N$ because A is noetherian and $I_n \subseteq I_{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{Ker}(\phi) = I_1 = \phi^N(I_{N+1}) = \phi^N(I_N) = \{0\}.$$

□

Lemma 1.1.6. *Let*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(C, m_C) \arrow[rr, "h"] & & (B, m_B) \\
& (A, m_A) \arrow[ul, "g"] \arrow[ur, "f"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

be a commutative diagram of local homomorphisms of noetherian local rings. We assume that f and g are flat, h is surjective and that h induces an isomorphism $C/m_AC \xrightarrow{\sim} B/m_AB$. Then, h is an isomorphism.

Proof. Let I be the kernel of h. Then, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to I \to C \to B \to 0.$$

Here B and C are flat over A. Thus, so is I over A. Therefore, tensoring A/m_A with the above exact sequence, it gives rise to an exact sequence

$$0 \to I/m_AI \to C/m_AC \to B/m_AB \to 0.$$

Here $C/m_AC \to B/m_AB$ is an isomorphism. Thus, $I = m_AI$. We assume that $I \neq 0$. Then, $m_C \in \operatorname{Supp}(I)$ as C-modules. Thus, I is faithfully flat over A by [8, Theorem 7.3]. Hence, by [8, Theorem 7.2], $I \neq m_AI$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $I = 0$. □

1.2. **Semistable varieties over an algebraically closed field.** Let k be an algebraically closed field and X an algebraic scheme over k. A closed point x of X is called *a semistable point of* X if the completion of the local ring at x is isomorphic to a ring of type

$$k[\![X_1,\dots,X_n]\!]/(X_1\cdots X_l).$$

The number l is called *the multiplicity of* X *at* x, and is denoted by $\operatorname{mult}_x(X)$. Moreover, we say X is a semistable variety over k if every closed point is a semistable point. By the following Proposition 1.2.1, the set of all semistable points of X is a Zariski open set. Thus, we say a point x of X (x is not necessarily closed) is *a* *semistable point* if there is a Zariski open set U of X such that $x \in U$ and every closed point of U is a semistable point. Let Ω be an algebraically closed field such that k is a subfield of Ω. Note that if X is a semistable variety over k, then so is $X_\Omega = X \times_{\operatorname{Spec}(k)} \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega)$ over Ω (cf. Proposition 1.2.2).

Proposition 1.2.1. *Let X be an algebraic scheme over an algebraically closed field k. If x is a semistable closed point of X, then there is a Zariski open set U of X such that $x \in U$ and every closed point of U is a semistable point.*

Proof. By Proposition 1.1.4, there are an étale neighborhood (U, x') of x and an étale morphism

$$\rho : U \to \operatorname{Spec}(k[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(T_1 \cdots T_l))$$

with $\rho(x') = (0, \ldots, 0)$. Note that $\operatorname{Spec}(k[T_1, \ldots, T_n]/(T_1 \cdots T_l))$ is a semistable variety over k. Thus, so is U over k. Therefore, every closed point of $\pi(U)$ is a semistable point. ☐

Proposition 1.2.2. *Let X be an algebraic scheme over an algebraically closed field k. Let Ω be an algebraically closed field such that k is a subfield of Ω. Let $\pi : X_\Omega = X \times_{\operatorname{Spec}(k)} \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega) \to X$ be the canonical morphism. For a point $y \in X_\Omega$, if $x = \pi(y)$ is a semistable point, then so is y.*

Proof. Let U be an open set of X containing x such that every closed point of U is a semistable point.

First we assume that y is a closed point. Let us choose a closed point $o \in \overline{\{x\}} \cap U$. By using Proposition 1.1.4 and shrinking U around o if necessarily, there are étale morphisms

$$f : V \to U \quad \text{and} \quad g : V \to W = \operatorname{Spec}(k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(X_1 \cdots X_l))$$

of algebraic schemes over k and closed points $o' \in V$ and $o'' \in W$ such that $f(o') = o$ and $g(o') = o'' = (0, \ldots, 0)$. Since $x \in U$, $o \in \overline{\{x\}} \cap U$ and f is faithfully flat at o', we can find $x' \in V$ with $f(x') = x$ and $o' \in \overline{\{x'\}}$. Here we set

$$\begin{cases} U_\Omega = U \times_{\operatorname{Spec}(k)} \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega), \\ V_\Omega = V \times_{\operatorname{Spec}(k)} \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega), \\ W_\Omega = \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(X_1 \cdots X_l)) \end{cases}$$

and the induced morphisms $V_\Omega \to U_\Omega$ and $V_\Omega \to W_\Omega$ are denoted by f_Ω and g_Ω respectively. Then, $y \in U_\Omega$. Let $\tilde{y} : \operatorname{Spec}(\Omega) \to U_\Omega$ be the morphism induced by y. Let $\kappa(y)$, $\kappa(x)$ and $\kappa(x')$ be the residue fields of y, x and x' respectively. Then, there is an embedding $\iota : \kappa(x') \hookrightarrow \Omega$ over k such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & \kappa(x') \arrow[lld, hook', "\iota"'] \\
\Omega & \kappa(y) \arrow[l, "\sim", "\tilde{y}^*"'] & \kappa(x) \arrow[l, hook'] \arrow[u, hook]
\end{tikzcd}$$

This gives rise to a morphism $\beta : \mathrm{Spec}(\Omega) \to V_\Omega$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & V_\Omega \arrow[r, "\pi'"] \arrow[d, "f_\Omega"] & V \arrow[d, "f"] \\
\mathrm{Spec}(\Omega) \arrow[ur, "\beta"] \arrow[r, "\tilde{y}"'] & U_\Omega \arrow[r, "\pi"] & U
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative and the image of $\pi' \circ \beta$ is x'. Let y' be the image of β. Then, $f_\Omega(y') = y$. Note that f_Ω and g_Ω are étale and the residue fields of y, y' and $y'' = g_\Omega(y')$ are Ω. Thus, we can see that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X_\Omega, y} \simeq \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{V_\Omega, y'} \simeq \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{W_\Omega, y''}.$$

We set $y'' = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{A}^n(\Omega)$ and $I = \{i \mid a_i = 0 \text{ and } i = 1, \ldots, l\}$. Note that $I \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, if we set $Z_i = X_i - a_i$ and $Z = \prod_{i \in I} Z_i$, then it is easy to see that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{W_\Omega, y''} = \Omega[\![Z_1, \ldots, Z_n]\!]/(Z).$$

Thus, we get our lemma in the case where y is a closed point.

Next we consider a general case. We set $U_\Omega = \pi^{-1}(U)$. Then, by the previous observation, every closed point of U_Ω is a semistable point. On the other hand, $y \in U_\Omega$. Thus, y is a semistable point. □

1.3. **Semistable schemes.** Let S be a locally noetherian scheme and $f : X \to S$ a morphism of finite type. First we assume that $S = \mathrm{Spec}(k)$ for some field k. Let $\bar{k}$ be the algebraic closure of k, $X' = X \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(k)} \mathrm{Spec}(\bar{k})$, and $\pi : X' \to X$ the canonical morphism. A point x of X is called *a semistable point of* X if every point x' of X' with $\pi(x') = x$ is a semistable point.

For a general S, we say $f : X \to S$ is *semistable at* $x \in X$ if f is flat at x and x is a semistable point of the fiber $f^{-1}(f(x))$ passing through x. Moreover, we say X is a semistable scheme over S if f is semistable at all points of X. By Proposition 1.2.2, for a flat morphism $f : X \to S$, X is a semistable scheme over S if and only if, for any algebraically closed field Ω, any morphism $\mathrm{Spec}(\Omega) \to S$ and any closed point $x' \in X \times_S \mathrm{Spec}(\Omega)$, the completion of the local ring at x' is isomorphic to a ring of type

$$\Omega[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X_1 \cdots X_l).$$

We say a semistable scheme X over S is proper if X is proper over S. Moreover, a proper semistable scheme X over S is said to be connected if $f_*(\mathcal{O}_X) = \mathcal{O}_S$. The following proposition is a local description of semistable scheme.

Proposition 1.3.1. *Let* $f : (A, m_A) \to (B, m_B)$ *be a flat local homomorphism of noetherian local rings such that* f *is essentially of finite type and* f *induces an isomorphism* $A/m_A \xrightarrow{\sim} B/m_B$*. We assume that there is an isomorphism*

$$(A/m_A)[\![T_1, \ldots, T_n]\!]/(T_1 \cdots T_l) \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{B}/m_A\widehat{B}$$

over A/m_A*. Then, there are a local homomorphism* $g : (A, m_A) \to (C, m_C)$ *of noetherian local rings and* $F \in C$ *with the following properties:*

1. g *is essentially of finite type and smooth over* A*, and* g *induces an isomorphism* $A/m_A \xrightarrow{\sim} C/m_C$*.*

(2) *There are* $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in C$ *such that* $dx_1, \ldots, dx_n$ *form a free basis of* $\Omega_{C/A}$ *and* $F - x_1 \cdots x_l \in m_A C$.

(3) *There is a local étale homomorphism* $\rho : B \to C/FC$ *over* A.

In particular, we have an isomorphism

$$A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - G) \xrightarrow{\sim} B$$

over A *for some* $G \in m_A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$.

Proof. If $l = 1$, then B is smooth over A. Thus, if we set C as the localization of $B[X]$ at the maximal ideal (X, m_B), then we get our desired result, so that we assume that $l \geq 2$.

We set $k = A/m_A$. Since B is essentially of finite type over A, there are a polynomial ring $A[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]$, a maximal ideal M of $A[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]$ and an ideal I of $k[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_M$ such that $A[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]/M = k$ and $B = A[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_M/I$. By abuse of notation, we denote $MA[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_M$ by M.

Let us begin with the following claim:

Claim 1.3.1.1. *There are a local* A*-algebra* (D, m_D)*, a surjective local homomorphism* $\phi : D \to B$ *and an element* F_0 *of* $D_0 = D/m_A D$ *such that* D *is essentially of finite type and smooth over* A*, and that the kernel of* $D_0 \to B_0 = B/m_A B$ *is* $F_0 D_0$.

We set

$$\begin{cases} E = A[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_M, \\ E_0 = A[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_M/m_A A[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_M = k[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_{M_0}, \end{cases}$$

where M_0 is the maximal ideal of $k[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]$ corresponding to M. As before, we also denote $M_0 k[Z_1, \ldots, Z_N]_{M_0}$ by M_0. Let $p : E \to E_0$ be the canonical surjective homomorphism. Let I_0 be the ideals of E_0 given by $I_0 = p(I)$. Then, $E_0/M_0 = k$ and $B_0 = E_0/I_0$. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_N$ be a system of parameters of E_0. Since $\widehat{B}_0 \simeq k[\![T_1, \ldots, T_n]\!]/(T_1 \cdots T_l)$, $M_0/(M_0^2 + I_0)$ has the dimension n over k. Therefore, after renumbering $u_1, \ldots, u_N$, we may assume that $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ gives rise to a basis of $M_0/(M_0^2 + I_0)$. Thus, for $i > n$, there are $a_{i1}, \ldots, a_{in} \in E_0$ such that

$$u_i - (a_{i1}u_1 + \cdots + a_{in}u_n) \in M_0^2 + I_0.$$

Therefore, we can find $g_i \in M_0^2$ and $h_i \in I_0$ with $h_i = u_i - (a_{i1}u_1 + \cdots + a_{in}u_n) + g_i$. Let us choose that $U_1, \ldots, U_n \in E$ and $H_{n+1}, \ldots, H_N \in I$ such that $p(U_i) = u_i$ and $p(H_j) = h_j$ ($i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $j = n+1, \ldots, N$). Here we consider a homomorphism

$$\rho : E^N \to \Omega_{E/A}$$

given by

$$\rho(e_i) = \begin{cases} dU_i & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n \\ dH_i & \text{if } n+1 \leq i \leq N, \end{cases}$$

where $\{e_1, \ldots, e_N\}$ is the standard basis of E^N. Since

$$du_1, \ldots, du_n, dh_{n+1}, \ldots, dh_N$$

form a basis of $\Omega_{E_0/k} = \Omega_{E/A} \otimes_A k$, by using Nakayama's lemma, we can see that ρ is surjective. Hence ρ is an isomorphism because $\Omega_{E/A}$ is a free E-module of rank N. Therefore,

$$dU_1, \ldots, dU_n, dH_{n+1}, \ldots, dH_N$$

form a free basis of $\Omega_{E/A}$. Here we set

$$D = E/(H_{n+1}, \dots, H_N) \quad \text{and} \quad D_0 = D/m_A D = E_0/(h_{n+1}, \dots, h_n)$$

Then, by the previous observation, D is smooth over A (cf. [3, Chaper VII, Theorem 5.7]), and D_0 is regular and $\dim D_0 = n$. On the other hand, since $\dim B_0 = n - 1$ and D_0 is UFD, there is $F_0 \in D_0$ with $B_0 = D_0/F_0 D_0$.

Let m_{D_0} and m_{B_0} be the maximal ideals of D_0 and B_0 respectively. Let $\phi_0 : D_0 \to B_0$ be the natural homomorphism, and let $\phi_0^h : D_0^h \to B_0^h$ and $\widehat{\phi}_0 : \widehat{D}_0 \to \widehat{B}_0$ be the induced homomorphisms.

Claim 1.3.1.2. *There are* $t_1, \dots, t_n \in D_0^h$ *such that* $\phi_0^h(t_1 \cdots t_l) = 0$ *and* $t_1, \dots, t_n$ *are a system of parameters of* D_0.

Let us consider the factorization of F_0 in $\widehat{D}_0$. Note that

$$\widehat{D}_0/F_0\widehat{D}_0 = \widehat{B}_0 \simeq k\llbracket T_1, \dots, T_n\rrbracket/(T_1 \cdots T_l).$$

Thus, we can see that there is a system of parameters $t'_1, \dots, t'_n$ of $\widehat{D}_0$ with $F_0 = ut'_1 \cdots t'_l$ for some $u \in \widehat{D}_0^{\times}$. In particular, $F_0 \in m_{D_0}^l \subseteq m_{D_0}^2$. Note that $B_0^h = D_0^h/F_0 D_0^h$ and $\widehat{B}_0 = \widehat{D}_0/F_0\widehat{D}_0$ (cf. [EGA IV, 18.6.8]). Since $\widehat{\phi}_0(t'_1) \cdots \widehat{\phi}_0(t'_l) = 0$, using Artin's approximation theorem [1] for $\widehat{B}_0$ and B_0^h, we can find $\bar{t}_1, \dots, \bar{t}_n \in B_0^h$ such that $\bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_l = 0$ and $\widehat{\phi}_0(t'_i) - \bar{t}_i \in m_{B_0}^2 \widehat{B}_0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let us choose $t_1, \dots, t_n$ with $\phi_0^h(t_i) = \bar{t}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then,

$$t'_i - t_i \in m_{D_0}^2 \widehat{D}_0 + F_0\widehat{D}_0 \subseteq m_{D_0}^2 \widehat{D}_0$$

for all i. Therefore, $t_1, \dots, t_n$ form a system of parameters of D_0^h and $\phi_0^h(t_1 \cdots t_l) = \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_l = 0$.

Let $\pi : B \to B_0$, $\pi' : D \to D_0$ and $\phi : D \to B$ be the natural surjective homomorphisms. These induce the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
D^h \arrow[r, "\phi^h"] \arrow[d, "{\pi'}^h"'] & B^h \arrow[d, "\pi^h"] \\
D_0^h \arrow[r, "\phi_0^h"] & B_0^h.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let us choose $x_1, \dots, x_n \in D^h$ with ${\pi'}^h(x_i) = t_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since

$$\pi^h(\phi^h(x_1 \cdots x_l)) = 0,$$

$\phi^h(x_1 \cdots x_l) \in m_A B^h$. Thus, there is $G \in m_A D^h$ such that

$$\phi^h(x_1 \cdots x_1 - G) = 0.$$

Claim 1.3.1.3. *A surjective homomorphism* $D^h/(x_1 \cdots x_l - G)D^h \to B^h$ *is an isomorphism.*

For this purpose, it is sufficient to see that $\widehat{D}/(x_1 \cdots x_l - G)\widehat{D} \to \widehat{B}$ is an isomorphism. By using Lemma 1.1.1, there is a surjective homomorphism

$$\mu : \widehat{A}\llbracket X_1, \dots, X_n\rrbracket \to \widehat{D}$$

defined by $\mu(X_i) = x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let us choose

$$G' \in \widehat{m}_A\llbracket X_1, \dots, X_n\rrbracket$$

with $\mu(G') = G$. Then, by Lemma 1.1.2, Lemma 1.1.5 and Lemma 1.1.6, a homomorphism

$$\widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - G') \to \widehat{B}$$

given by the composition of homomorphisms

$$\widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - G') \to \widehat{D}/(x_1 \cdots x_l - G)\widehat{D} \to \widehat{B}$$

is an isomorphism. Therefore, so is $\widehat{D}/(x_1 \cdots x_l - G)\widehat{D} \to \widehat{B}$.

By the above claim, $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi)D^h = (x_1 \cdots x_l - G)D^h$. We choose a local étale neighborhood $(D, m_D) \to (C, m_C)$ of $\operatorname{Spec}(D)$ such that $D/m_D \simeq C/m_C, T_1, \ldots, T_n, G \in C$ and $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi)C = (x_1 \cdots x_l - G)C$. Then,

$$B = D \otimes_D (D/\operatorname{Ker}(\phi)) \to C \otimes_D (D/\operatorname{Ker}(\phi)) = C/(x_1 \cdots x_l - G)C$$

is étale. Moreover, we can see that $dx_1, \ldots, dx_n$ form a free basis of $\Omega_{C/A}$ in the same way as before because $dt_1, \ldots, dt_n$ are a basis of $\Omega_{C_0/k}$, where $C_0 = C/m_A C$. □

2. Preliminaries to log schemes

2.1. **Pushout in the category of monoids.**

In the following, every monoid is a commutative monoid with the unity. Let $f : Q \to P$ and $g : Q \to R$ be homomorphisms of monoids. Then, $P \boxplus_Q R$ is defined as follows: We define a relation $\sim$ on $P \times R$ by

$$(p, r) \sim (p', r') \iff (p, r) \cdot (f(q), g(q')) = (p', r') \cdot (f(q'), g(q)) \text{ for some } q, q' \in Q.$$

Then, $\sim$ is an equivalence relation on $P \times R$. Indeed, if $(p, r) \sim (p', r')$ and $(p', r') \sim (p'', r'')$, then there are $q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4 \in Q$ with

$$\begin{cases} (p, r) \cdot (f(q_1), g(q_2)) = (p', r') \cdot (f(q_2), g(q_1)), \\ (p', r') \cdot (f(q_3), g(q_4)) = (p'', r'') \cdot (f(q_4), g(q_3)). \end{cases}$$

Thus,

$$(p, r) \cdot (f(q_1 q_3), g(q_2 q_4)) = (p'', r'') \cdot (f(q_2 q_4), g(q_1 q_3)).$$

Hence we set

$$P \boxplus_Q R = P \times R/\sim .$$

The following are elementary properties of $P \boxplus_Q R$.

Lemma 2.1.1. (1) *$P \boxplus_Q R$ is a monoid in the natural way and we have a commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} Q \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & R \arrow[d, "\beta"] \\ P \arrow[r, "\alpha"] & P \boxplus_Q R. \end{tikzcd}$$

(2) *Let*

$$\begin{tikzcd} Q \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & R \arrow[d, "\beta'"] \\ P \arrow[r, "\alpha'"] & M \end{tikzcd}$$

be a commutative diagram of monoids. We set $\delta = \alpha' \circ f = \beta' \circ g$. *We assume that* $m \cdot \delta(q) = m' \cdot \delta(q)$ *implies* $m = m'$ *for any* $m, m' \in M$ *and* $q \in Q$. *Then, there is the unique homomorphism* $\gamma : P \boxplus_Q R \to M$ *such that the following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Q \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, "f"'] & R \arrow[d, "\beta"] \arrow[rdd, "\beta'"] & \\
P \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[rrd, "\alpha'"'] & P \boxplus_Q R \arrow[rd, "\gamma"] & \\
& & M
\end{tikzcd}$$

(3) *If one of* P, Q, R *is a group, then* $P \boxplus_Q R$ *is the pushout of* $(f : Q \to P, g : Q \to R)$ *in the category of monoids.*

(4) *If* P *and* R *are integral, then so is* $P \boxplus_Q R$. *Moreover,* $P \boxplus_Q R$ *has the following universality: In the commutative diagram in* (2), *if* M *is integral, then there is the unique homomorphism* $\gamma : P \boxplus_Q R \to M$ *with* $\alpha' = \gamma \circ \alpha$ *and* $\beta' = \gamma \circ \beta$. *Namely,* $P \boxplus_Q R$ *is the pushout of* $(f : Q \to P, g : Q \to R)$ *in the category of integral monoids.*

(5) *Let* $h : R \to S$ *be another homomorphism of monoids. We assume that an equation* $s \cdot h(r) = s' \cdot h(r)$ *for* $s, s' \in S$ *and* $r \in R$ *implies* $s = s'$. *Then, there is a natural isomorphism*

$$P \boxplus_Q S \xrightarrow{\sim} (P \boxplus_Q R) \boxplus_R S.$$

Proof. (1) We denote the class of (p, r) by $[p, r]$. It is easy to see that if $(p, r) \sim (p', r')$ and $(s, t) \sim (s', t')$, then $(p, r) \cdot (s, t) \sim (p', r') \cdot (s', t')$. Thus, the product of $P \boxplus_Q R$ is given by $[p, r] \cdot [p', r'] = [pp', rr']$. Moreover, $\alpha(p) = [p, 1]$ and $\beta(r) = [1, r]$.

(2) The uniqueness of γ is obvious. We would like to define γ to be

$$\gamma([p, r]) = \alpha'(p) \cdot \beta'(r).$$

For this purpose, we assume that $[p, r] = [p', r']$, that is, there are $q, q' \in Q$ with

$$(p, r) \cdot (f(q), g(q')) = (p', r') \cdot (f(q'), g(q)).$$

Thus,

$$(\alpha'(p) \cdot \delta(q)) \cdot (\beta'(r) \cdot \delta(q')) = (\alpha'(p') \cdot \delta(q')) \cdot (\beta'(r') \cdot \delta(q)).$$

Therefore, $\alpha'(p) \cdot \beta'(r) = \alpha'(p') \cdot \beta'(r')$.

(3) We need to show that $m \cdot \delta(q) = m' \cdot \delta(q)$ implies $m = m'$. If Q is a group, then there is $q^{-1} \in Q$. Thus, $m = m'$. Next we assume that P is a group. Then, there is $f(q)^{-1} \in P$. Thus, $m \cdot \alpha'(f(q)) = m' \cdot \alpha'(f(q))$ implies $m = m'$. If R is a group, then we have our assertion in the same way as in the case where P is a group.

(4) We assume $[p, r] \cdot [s, t] = [p', r'] \cdot [s, t]$. Then, there are $q, q' \in Q$ with

$$(ps, rt) \cdot (f(q), g(q')) = (p's, r't) \cdot (f(q'), g(q)).$$

Here P and R are integral. Thus,

$$(p, r) \cdot (f(q), g(q')) = (p', r') \cdot (f(q'), g(q)).$$

Thus, $[p, r] = [p', r']$. The later part is a consequence of (2)

(5) Here we define

$$\phi : P \boxplus_Q S \to (P \boxplus_Q R) \boxplus_R S$$

to be $\phi(p, s) = [[p, 1], s]$. This is well-defined. For, if $(p, s) \sim (p', s')$, then there are $q_1, q_2 \in Q$ with $(p, s) \cdot (f(q_1), h(g(q_2)) = (p', s') \cdot (f(q_2), h(g(q_1))$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} ([p,1],s)\cdot(\beta(g(q_1)),h(g(q_2))) &= ([p,1],s)\cdot(\alpha(f(q_1)),h(g(q_2))) \\ &= ([pf(q_1),1],sh(g(q_2))) \\ &= ([p'f(q_2),1],s'h(g(q_1))) \\ &= ([p',1],s')\cdot(\alpha(f(q_2)),h(g(q_1))) \\ &= ([p',1],s')\cdot(\beta(g(q_2)),h(g(q_1))). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $([p, r], s) \sim ([p, 1], h(r)s)$, ϕ is surjective. Finally, we assume that $\phi(p, s) = \phi(p', s')$. Then, there are $r_1, r_2 \in R$ such that $(p, r_1) \sim (p', r_2)$ and $sh(r_2) = s'h(r_1)$. Thus, there are q_1, q_2 with $pf(q_1) = p'f(q_2)$ and $r_1g(q_2) = r_2g(q_1)$. Hence

$$sh(g(q_2))h(r_1) = sh(g(q_1))h(r_2) = s'h(g(q_1))h(r_1),$$

which implies that $sh(g(q_2)) = s'h(g(q_1))$ by our assumption. Therefore, $[p, s] = [p', s']$. □

2.2. **Semistable structure of monoids.** First, let us recall a semistable structure of a monoid. For details, see [6]. Here, the binary operators of monoids are written in the additive way. Let $f : Q \to P$ be an integral homomorphism of fine and sharp monoids. Let σ be a finite subset of P. For $T \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma = \mathrm{Map}(\sigma, \mathbb{N})$, we denote an element $\sum_{x\in\sigma} T(x)x$ of P by $T \cdot \sigma$. For $q_0 \in Q$ and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$, we say P has a semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B) over Q (or P is of semistable type (σ, q_0, Δ, B) over Q) if the following conditions are satisfied:

(S1) $q_0 \neq 0$, $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \neq \emptyset$ and $\Delta(x)$ is either 0 or 1 for all $x \in \sigma$.

(S2) P is generated by σ and $f(Q)$ and the natural homomorphism $\mathbb{N}^\sigma \to P$ given by $T \mapsto T \cdot \sigma$ is injective.

(S3) $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(B) = \emptyset$ and $\Delta \cdot \sigma = f(q_0) + B \cdot \sigma$.

(S4) If we have a relation

$$T \cdot \sigma = f(q) + T' \cdot \sigma \quad (T, T' \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma)$$

with $q \neq 0$, then $T(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$.

The following are basic properties of a semistable structure (cf. [6, Proposition 2.2]):

(A) Let $T, T' \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$ and $q \in Q$. If $T \cdot \sigma = f(q) + T' \cdot \sigma$, $q \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(T) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(T') = \emptyset$, then $q = nq_0$, $T = n\Delta$ and $T' = nB$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(B) Let $T, T' \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$ and $q, q' \in Q$. If $T \cdot \sigma + f(q) = T' \cdot \sigma + f(q')$ and there are $x, x' \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$ with $T(x) = T'(x') = 0$, then $T = T'$ and $q = q'$.

(C) Let $\mathbb{N} \to Q \times \mathbb{N}^{\sigma\setminus\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)}$ and $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}^{\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)}$ be homomorphisms given by $1 \mapsto (f(q_0), B|_{\sigma\setminus\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)})$ and $1 \mapsto \Delta|_{\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)}$ respectively. Then,

$$P \simeq (Q \times \mathbb{N}^{\sigma\setminus\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)}) \boxplus_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{N}^{\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)}.$$

Let us begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2.2. *Let $f : Q \to P$ be an integral homomorphism of fine and sharp monoids. We assume that P has a semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B) over Q for some $\sigma \subseteq P$, $q_0 \in Q$ and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$. Then, the following are equivalent.*

(1) *$f : Q \to P$ does not split, that is, there is no sub-monoid N of P with $P = f(Q) \times N$.*
(2) *$\#(\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)) \geq 2$.*
(3) *For all $x \in \sigma$, x is irreducible and $x \notin f(Q)$.*

Proof. (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2): We assume $\#(\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)) = 1$. We set $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) = \{p\}$ and $\sigma' = \sigma \setminus \{p\}$. Then, since $p = f(q_0) + B \cdot \sigma$, P is generated by σ' and $f(Q)$. Let N be a sub-monoid of P generated by σ'. Let us see that $P = f(Q) \times N$. For this purpose, it is sufficient to see that if $I \cdot \sigma + f(q) = I' \cdot \sigma + f(q')$ with $I(p) = I'(p) = 0$, then $I = I'$ and $q = q'$. This is nothing more than the above property (B).

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3): Let x be an element of σ. First of all, let us see that if $x = I \cdot \sigma + f(q)$ for some $I \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ and $q \in Q$, then $I = I_x$ and $q = 0$, where $I_x \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ is given by

$$I_x(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y = x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, if $q = 0$, then $I = I_x$. Thus, we assume that $q \neq 0$. If $x \notin \mathrm{Supp}(I)$, then, by the property (A), $I_x = n\Delta$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This is impossible because $\#(\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)) \geq 2$. Thus, $x \in \mathrm{Supp}(I)$. Therefore, we have $(I - I_x) \cdot \sigma + f(q) = 0$. Here P is sharp. Hence $I = I_x$ and $q = 0$. This is a contradiction.

We assume that $x \in f(Q)$. Then, there is $q \in Q$ with $x = f(q)$. Thus, by the above claim, we have a contradiction.

Next we assume that $x = y + z$ for some $y, z \in P$. We set $y = I \cdot \sigma + f(q)$ and $z = I' \cdot \sigma + f(q')$. Then, $x = (I + I') \cdot \sigma + f(q + q')$. Thus, $I_x = I + I'$ and $q + q' = 0$. Therefore, we can see either $y = 0$ or $z = 0$.

(3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1): We assume that there is a sub-monoid N of P with $P = f(Q) \times N$. First, let us see that $\sigma \subseteq N$. For $x \in \sigma$, we can set $x = y + z$ for some $y \in f(Q)$ and $z \in N$. Since x is irreducible, either $y = 0$ or $z = 0$. If $z = 0$, then $x \in f(Q)$. Thus, $y = 0$, that is, $x \in N$. Let us consider the relation

$$\Delta \cdot \sigma = f(q_0) + B \cdot \sigma.$$

Then, since $\sigma \subseteq N$, we have $\Delta \cdot \sigma = B \cdot \sigma$ and $q_0 = 0$. This is a contradiction. □

Let us consider the uniqueness of a semistable structure.

Proposition 2.2.3. *Let $f : Q \to P$ be an integral homomorphism of fine and sharp monoids. Then, we have the following:*

(1) *We assume that P has semistable structures*

$$(\sigma, q_0, \Delta, B) \quad \textit{and} \quad (\sigma', q_0', \Delta', B')$$

over Q for some $\sigma, \sigma' \subseteq P$, $q_0, q_0' \in Q$, $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ and $\Delta', B' \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma'}$. If $\sigma = \sigma'$, then $q_0 = q_0'$, $\Delta = \Delta'$ and $B = B'$.

(2) *We assume that $f : Q \to P$ does not split. Then, there is the unique semistable structure of P over Q if it exists.*

Proof. (1) Note that $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta') \cap \mathrm{Supp}(B') = \emptyset$. Thus, by the property (B),

$$\Delta' \cdot \sigma = f(q_0') + B' \cdot \sigma$$

implies that $\Delta' = n\Delta$, $B' = nB$ and $q_0' = nq_0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Considering $\Delta' = n\Delta$, we can see $n = 1$.

(2) By Lemma 2.2.2, for all $x \in \sigma$, x is irreducible and $x \not\in f(Q)$. Moreover, since P is generated by σ and $f(Q)$, we can see that σ is the set of all irreducible elements of P not lying in $f(Q)$. Therefore, (1) implies (2). $\square$

The above proposition gives rise to the following definition.

Definition 2.2.4. Let $f : Q \to P$ be an integral homomorphism of fine and sharp monoids such that $f : Q \to P$ does not split. We assume that P has the semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B) over Q. Then, q_0 is called *the marking of* $f : Q \to P$, and is denoted by $\mathrm{mark}(P/Q)$.

Here we consider the invariance of the marking of the semistable structure by a generalization.

Proposition 2.2.5. *Let $f : Q \to P$ be a homomorphism of fine and sharp monoids. Let N be a sub-monoid of P and $\bar{P} = P/N$ the quotient monoid of P by N, i.e., $\bar{P}$ is the quotient set given by the following equivalence relation $\sim$:*

$$p \sim p' \iff p + n = p' + n' \ (\exists n, n' \in N).$$

Let $\pi : P \to \bar{P}$ be the natural homomorphism and $\bar{f} = \pi \circ f : Q \to \bar{P}$ the composition of maps. We assume that (i) *$\bar{P}$ is fine and sharp,* (ii) *f and $\bar{f}$ are integral and that* (iii) *P has a semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B) over Q for some $\sigma \subseteq P$, $q_0 \in Q$ and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$. If we set $\sigma' = \{x \in \sigma \mid \pi(x) \neq 0\}$ and $\bar{\sigma} = \pi(\sigma')$, then the natural map $\alpha : \sigma' \to \bar{\sigma}$ induced by π is bijective. Moreover, if we set $\bar{\Delta} = \Delta \circ \alpha^{-1}$ and $\bar{B} = B \circ \alpha^{-1}$ as elements of $\mathbb{N}^{\bar{\sigma}}$, then $(\bar{\sigma}, q_0, \bar{\Delta}, \bar{B})$ gives rise to a semistable structure of $\bar{P}$ over Q.*

Proof. First of all, note that $N \subseteq \pi^{-1}(0)$. We set $\sigma'' = \{x \in \sigma \mid \pi(x) = 0\}$.

Claim 2.2.5.1. *$\pi^{-1}(0)$ is generated by σ''.*

Let N' be the sub-monoid generated by σ''. Clearly, $N' \subseteq \pi^{-1}(0)$. Conversely, let a be an element of $\pi^{-1}(0)$. We can write a as a form $T \cdot \sigma + f(q)$, where $T \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ and $q \in Q$. Then, $\sum_{x \in \sigma} T(x)\pi(x) + \bar{f}(q) = 0$. Thus, since $\bar{P}$ is sharp, we have $T(x)\pi(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \sigma$ and $\bar{f}(q) = 0$. Therefore, $q = 0$ and $x \in \sigma''$ if $T(x) > 0$. This means that $c \in N'$.

Claim 2.2.5.2. *If $\pi(a) = \pi(b)$ for $a = \sum_{x \in \sigma'} a_x x$ and $b = \sum_{x \in \sigma'} b_x x$ of P, then $a = b$.*

We choose $A, B \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ such that $A \cdot \sigma = a$, $B \cdot \sigma = b$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(A), \mathrm{Supp}(B) \subseteq \sigma'$. Then, by using the above claim, there are T and T' of $\mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ with $\mathrm{Supp}(T), \mathrm{Supp}(T') \subseteq \sigma''$ and $A \cdot \sigma + T \cdot \sigma = B \cdot \sigma + T' \cdot \sigma$. Thus, $A + T = B + T'$. For $x \in \sigma'$,

$$A(x) = A(x) + T(x) = B(x) + T'(x) = B(x).$$

Therefore, $A = B$.

By the above claim, we can see $\alpha : \sigma' \to \bar{\sigma}$ is bijective. From now on, let us see that $\bar{P}$ is of semistable type $(\bar{\sigma}, q_0, \bar{\Delta}, \bar{B})$ over Q according to the conditions (S1) – (S4) of semistable structure.

(S1): We need to see $\mathrm{Supp}(\bar{\Delta}) \neq \emptyset$. We assume the contrary. Then, $\pi(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$. Thus,

$$0 = \bar{f}(q_0) + \sum_{x \in \Sigma} B(x)\pi(x).$$

Here $\bar{P}$ is sharp and $\bar{f}$ is integral. Therefore, we have $q_0 = 0$. This is a contradiction.

(S2): Let us consider a natural commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{N}^{\sigma'} \arrow[d] & \mathbb{N}^{\bar{\sigma}} \arrow[l, "\sim", "-\circ\alpha"'] \arrow[d] \\
P \arrow[r, "\pi"] & \bar{P}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then, Claim 2.2.5.2, implies that $\mathbb{N}^{\bar{\sigma}} \to \bar{P}$ is injective.

(S3): This is obvious in our case.

(S4): Finally, let us consider a relation

$$\bar{T} \cdot \bar{\sigma} = \bar{f}(q) + \bar{T}' \cdot \bar{\sigma} \quad (\bar{T}, \bar{T}' \in \mathbb{N}^{\bar{\sigma}})$$

with $q \neq 0$. We choose $T, T' \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ such that $\mathrm{Supp}(T), \mathrm{Supp}(T') \subseteq \sigma'$, $\bar{T} = T \circ \alpha^{-1}$ and $\bar{T}' = T' \circ \alpha^{-1}$. Then, $\pi(T \cdot \sigma) = \pi(f(q) + T \cdot \sigma)$. Thus, there are $S, S' \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ such that $\mathrm{Supp}(S), \mathrm{Supp}(S') \subseteq \sigma''$ and

$$T \cdot \sigma + S \cdot \sigma = f(q) + T \cdot \sigma + S' \cdot \sigma.$$

Therefore, $(T + S)(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$. In particular,

$$T(x) = (T + S)(x) > 0$$

for all $x \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \cap \sigma'$. This means that $\bar{T}(\bar{x}) > 0$ for all $\bar{x} \in \mathrm{Supp}(\bar{\Delta})$. □

Finally, we consider the following proposition.

Proposition 2.2.6. *Let $f : Q \to P$ be an integral homomorphism of fine and sharp monoids. If P has a semistable structure for some $\sigma \subseteq P$, $q_0 \in Q$, $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$, then* $\mathrm{Coker}(Q^{gr} \to P^{gr})$ *is torsion free.*

Proof. First of all, note that every element of P can be written as a form $I \cdot \sigma + f(q)$ with $I \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$, $q \in Q$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(I)$. Let us choose $x \in \mathrm{Coker}(Q^{gr} \to P^{gr})$ with $nx = 0$ for some positive integer n. Then, there are $I_1, I_2 \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$, $q_1, q_2 \in Q$ such that $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(I_1)$, $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(I_2)$ and x is equal to

$$(I_1 \cdot \sigma + f(q_1)) - (I_2 \cdot \sigma + f(q_2))$$

as an element of P^{gr}. Since $nx = 0$ in $\mathrm{Coker}(Q^{gr} \to P^{gr})$, there are $q_3, q_4 \in Q$ with

$$n(I_1 \cdot \sigma + f(q_1)) - n(I_2 \cdot \sigma + f(q_2)) = f(q_3) - f(q_4).$$

Thus,

$$nI_1 \cdot \sigma + f(nq_1 + q_4) = nI_2 \cdot \sigma + f(nq_2 + q_3).$$

Therefore, $nI_1 = nI_2$ because $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(nI_1)$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) \not\subseteq \mathrm{Supp}(nI_2)$. Hence $I_1 = I_2$. Thus,

$$x = (I_1 \cdot \sigma + f(q_1)) - (I_2 \cdot \sigma + f(q_2)) = f(q_1) - f(q_2),$$

which means that $x = 0$ in $\mathrm{Coker}(Q^{gr} \to P^{gr})$. □

2.3. **Extension of a ring for a good chart.** Here we consider a ring extension to get a good chart.

Proposition 2.3.1. *Let* (A, m) *be a noetherian local ring,* $S = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ *and* s *the closed point of* S*. Let* M_S *be a fine log structure on* S*. Then, there is a local homomorphism* $f : (A, m) \to (B, n)$ *of noetherian local rings with the following properties:*

1. B/n *is algebraic over* A/m*, and* f *is flat and quasi-finite.*
2. *Let* $f^a : S' = \operatorname{Spec}(B) \to S = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ *be the induced homomorphism,* s' *the closed point of* $S' = \operatorname{Spec}(B)$*, and* $M_{S'} = (f^a)^*(M_S)$*. There are a fine and sharp monoid* Q *and a homomorphism* $\pi_Q : Q \to M_{S',s'}$ *such that* $Q \to M_{S',\bar{s}'} \to \overline{M}_{S',\bar{s}'}$ *is bijective.*

Proof. Let us begin with the following lemma:

Lemma 2.3.2. *Let* G *be a finitely generated abelian group and* R *a ring. Let us fix an element* δ *of* $\operatorname{Ext}^1(G, R^\times)$*. Then, there are* $u_1, \ldots, u_l \in R^\times$ *and integers* $a_1, \ldots, a_l \geq 2$ *with the following property:*

1. $a_1 \cdots a_l$ *is equal to the order of the torsion part of* G*.*
2. *For any homomorphism* $f : R \to S$ *of rings, if there are* $v_1, \ldots, v_l$ *with* $v_i^{a_i} = f(u_i)$ *for all* i*, then the image of* δ *via the canonical homomorphism*
$$\operatorname{Ext}^1(G, R^\times) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1(G, S^\times)$$
is zero.

Proof. By the fundamental theorem of abelian groups, we have the following exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^l \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbb{Z}^{l'} \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow 0,$$

where ϕ is given by $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_l) = (a_1x_1, \ldots, a_lx_l, 0, \ldots, 0)$ for some integers $a_1, \ldots, a_l \geq 2$. Note that $a_1 \cdots a_l$ is equal to the order of the torsion part of G. The above exact sequence gives rise to an exact sequence

$$\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^{l'}, R^\times) \xrightarrow{\phi_R^*} \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^l, R^\times) \xrightarrow{\alpha_R} \operatorname{Ext}^1(G, R^\times) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathbb{Z}^{l'}, R^\times).$$

Note that $\operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathbb{Z}^{l'}, R^\times) = \{0\}$. Thus, there is $h \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^l, R^\times)$ with $\alpha_R(h) = \delta$. We set $u_i = h(e_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, l$.

Let $f : R \to S$ be any homomorphism of rings with $v_i^{a_i} = f(u_i)$ $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ for some $v_1, \ldots, v_l \in S$. Let us consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^{l'}, R^\times) \arrow[r, "\phi_R^*"] \arrow[d, "g_1"'] & \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^l, R^\times) \arrow[r, "\alpha_R"] \arrow[d, "g_2"'] & \operatorname{Ext}^1(G, R^\times) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "g_3"'] & 0 \\
\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^{l'}, S^\times) \arrow[r, "\phi_S^*"] & \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^l, S^\times) \arrow[r, "\alpha_S"] & \operatorname{Ext}^1(G, S^\times) \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that $g_2(h)(e_i) = f(u_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Thus, if we set $h' \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^{l'}, S^\times)$ by

$$h'(e_i) = \begin{cases} v_i & \text{if } i = 1, \ldots. l \\ 0 & \text{if } i > l \end{cases}$$

then $\phi_S^*(h') = g_2(h)$. Therefore,

$$g_3(\delta) = g_3(\alpha_R(h)) = \alpha_S(g_2(h)) = \alpha_S(\phi_S^*(h')) = 0.$$

□

Let us start the proof of Proposition 2.3.1. Let $\delta \in \operatorname{Ext}^1(\overline{M}^{gr}_{S,\bar{s}}, \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S,\bar{s}})$ be the extension class of

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S,\bar{s}} \to M^{gr}_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}^{gr}_{S,\bar{s}} \to 0.$$

Then, by Lemma 2.3.2, there are $u_1, \ldots, u_l \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S,\bar{s}}$ and integers $a_1, \ldots, a_l$ with the properties as in Lemma 2.3.2. Let us choose an étale neighborhood (U, u) of s such that $u_1, \ldots, u_l \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{U,u}$. Let B be the localization of

$$\mathcal{O}_{U,u}[X_1, \ldots, X_l]/(X_1^{a_1} - u_1, \ldots, X_l^{a_l} - u_l).$$

at a closed point over u. Then, B is flat and quasi-finite over A. Let v_i be the class of X_i in B. Note that $v_i^{a_i} = u_i$ in B for all i. Let s' be the closed point of $S' = \operatorname{Spec}(B)$, $\pi : S' \to S$ the canonical morphism, and $M_{S'} = \pi^*(M_S)$. Then, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S',\bar{s}'} \to M^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'} \to \overline{M}^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'} \to 0.$$

Since $M^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'}$ is the push-out $\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S',\bar{s}'} \times_{\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S,\bar{s}}} M^{gr}_{S,\bar{s}}$, we can see that $\overline{M}^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'} = \overline{M}^{gr}_{S,\bar{s}}$ and the extension class δ' of the above exact sequence is the image of the canonical homomorphism $\operatorname{Ext}^1(\overline{M}^{gr}_{S,\bar{s}}, \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S,\bar{s}}) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1(\overline{M}^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'}, \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S',\bar{s}'})$. Thus, by Lemma 2.3.2, $\delta' = 0$. Therefore, we have a splitting $s : \overline{M}^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'} \to M^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'}$ of $M^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'} \to \overline{M}^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'}$. Here we set $Q = \overline{M}_{S',\bar{s}'}$. Let us see that $s(q) \in M_{S',\bar{s}'}$ for all $q \in Q$. Indeed, if we denote $M^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'} \to \overline{M}^{gr}_{S',\bar{s}'}$ by π, then $\pi(s(q)) = q$. Thus, there are $u \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{S',\bar{s}'}$ and $m \in M_{S',\bar{s}'}$ with $s(q) = m \cdot u$, which implies $s(q) \in M_{S',\bar{s}'}$. Moreover, $Q \to M_{S',\bar{s}'} \to \overline{M}_{S',\bar{s}'}$ is the identity map. Furthermore, changing S' by an étale neighborhood of S', we can see that $Q \to M_{S',\bar{s}}$ is defined on S'. □

2.4. **Local structure theorem.** Let $\alpha : M_X \to \mathcal{O}_X$ be a log structure on a scheme X. For $x \in X$, an element $p \in \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is said to be regular if there is $m \in M_{X,\bar{x}}$ such that p is m modulo $\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $\alpha(m)$ is a regular element of $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$. Note that the regularity of p does not depend on the choice of m.

Theorem 2.4.1. *Let $(f, h) : (X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$ be a smooth and integral morphism of fine log schemes. Let x be an element of X and $s = f(x)$. We assume that $f : X \to S$ is semistable at x. Then, we have the following:*

1. *If f is smooth at x, then there is a submonoid N of $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ such that $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}} = \bar{h}_{\bar{x}}(\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}) \times N$ and N is isomorphic to $\mathbb{N}^a$ for some non-negative integer a. Further, every element of N is regular.*
2. *If f is not smooth at x and $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}} : \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ splits, there is a submonoid N of $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ such that $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}} = \bar{h}_{\bar{x}}(\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}) \times N$ and N is isomorphic to the monoid arising from monomials of*

   $$\mathbb{Z}[U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_a]/(U_1^2 - U_2^2)$$

   for some $a \geq 2$. In this case, the characteristic of the residue field of $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is not equal to 2. Further, every element of N is regular.
3. *If f is not smooth at x and $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}} : \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ does not split, then $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ has the unique semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B) over $\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ for some $\sigma \subseteq \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ with $\#(\sigma) \geq 2$, $q_0 \in \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$. More precisely, σ is the set*

of all irreducible elements of $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ *not lying in* $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}}(\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}})$. *Further, every element of* $\sigma \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$ *is regular.*

Proof. Let us begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4.2. *Let* $f : X \to Y$ *be a morphism of schemes and* M_Y *a fine log structure on* Y. *If we set* $M_X = f^*(M_Y)$, *then, for any* $x \in X$ *and* $y \in Y$ *with* $y = f(x)$, *the induced homomorphism* $\overline{M}_{Y,\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ *is bijective.*

Proof. Let P be a chart of $M_{Y,\bar{y}}$. Then, $\overline{M}_{Y,\bar{y}}$ and $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is given by

$$P/\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\times}) \quad \text{and} \quad P/{\pi'}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times})$$

respectively, where $\pi : P \to \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}$ is the canonical morphism and $\pi' : P \to \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ (cf. [5] and [6]). Thus, it is sufficient to see that $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\times}) = {\pi'}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times})$. Indeed, letting $m_{\bar{x}}$ and $m_{\bar{y}}$ be the maximal ideals of $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}$, and $\alpha : \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ be the canonical homomorphism,

$$p \in \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\times}) \iff \pi(p) \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\times} \iff \alpha(\pi(p)) \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times} \iff p \in {\pi'}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times})$$

because $\alpha(m_{\bar{y}}) \subseteq m_{\bar{x}}$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\times}) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}$. □

Let us go back to the proof of Theorem 2.4.1. Let us consider the geometric fiber $X_{\bar{s}}$ over s. Then, by using Lemma 2.4.2, we may assume that $S = \mathrm{Spec}(k)$ for some algebraically closed field k. Thus, the theorem follows from [6, Theorem 3.1] except the following facts:

(i) N is isomorphic to the monoid T arising from monomials of

$$\mathbb{Z}[U_1, U_2, \dots, U_a]/(U_1^2 - U_2^2)$$

in the case (2).

(ii) The regularity of elements of either N or $\sigma \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$.

(i) Let T_k be the the monoid arising from monomials of

$$k[U_1, U_2, \dots, U_a]/(U_1^2 - U_2^2).$$

In order to see (i), we need to show the natural homomorphism $T \to T_k$ is bijective. Let $\bar{U}_1^{e_1}\bar{U}_2^{e_2}\cdots\bar{U}_a^{e_a}$ and $\bar{U}_1^{e'_1}\bar{U}_2^{e'_2}\cdots\bar{U}_a^{e'_a}$ be elements of T. Clearly, we may assume that $e_1, e'_1 \in \{0, 1\}$. We suppose that $\bar{U}_1^{e_1}\bar{U}_2^{e_2}\cdots\bar{U}_a^{e_a} = \bar{U}_1^{e'_1}\bar{U}_2^{e'_2}\cdots\bar{U}_a^{e'_a}$ in $k[U_1, U_2, \dots, U_a]/(U_1^2 - U_2^2)$. Then, there is $\phi \in k[U_1, \dots. U_a]$ with

$$U_1^{e_1}U_2^{e_2}\cdots U_a^{e_a} - U_1^{e'_1}U_2^{e'_2}\cdots U_a^{e'_a} = (U_1^2 - U_2^2)\phi.$$

Comparing the degrees with respect to U_1 of both sides, we can see that $\phi = 0$. Therefore, $(e_1, \dots, e_a) = (e'_1, \dots, e'_a)$.

(ii) Let $(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}, m_{S,s}) \to (A, m)$ be a flat local homomorphism of local rings. We set $S' = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$, $X' = X \times_S S'$ and the induced morphisms as follows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r, "\pi'"] \arrow[d, "f'"'] & X \arrow[d, "f"] \\
S' \arrow[r, "\pi"] & S.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let us choose $x' \in X'$ with $f'(x') = m$ and $\pi'(x') = x$. Then, since $\mathcal{O}_{X,x} \to \mathcal{O}_{X',x'}$ is faithfully flat, using Lemma 2.4.2, if regularity holds at x', then so does at x.

Let k be the algebraic closure of the residue field at x. Note that by virtue of [EGA III, Chapter 0, 10.3.1], there are a noetherian local ring (A, m) and a local homomorphism $(\mathcal{O}_{S,s}, m_{S,s}) \to (A, m)$ such that $m_{S,s}A = m$, A/m is isomorphic to k over $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}/m_{S,s}$ and that A is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$. Therefore, we may assume that $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}/m_{S,s}$ is algebraically closed and x is a closed point. Moreover, by using Proposition 2.3.1, we may further assume that there are a fine and sharp monoid Q and a homomorphism $\pi_Q : Q \to M_{S,s}$ such that $Q \to M_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is bijective. Hence, there is a fine and sharp monoids P together with homomorphisms $f : Q \to P$ and $\pi_P : P \to M_{X,\bar{s}}$ such that the following properties are satisfied:

(a) The diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} Q \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, "\pi_Q"'] & P \arrow[d, "\pi_P"] \\ M_{S,\bar{s}} \arrow[r] & M_{X,\bar{x}}, \end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

(b) The induced homomorphism $P \to M_{X,\bar{x}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is bijective.

(c) The natural homomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{s}}$$

is smooth.

Since $\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{s}}$ is smooth, it is sufficient to see the regularity of each element in $\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P]$.

If there is a submonoid N of P with $P = f(Q) \times N$, then

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] = \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[N].$$

Thus, the assertions follow from Lemma 2.4.3 below.

Next, we assume that $f : Q \to P$ does not splits. Let us set $\sigma = \{p_1, \ldots, p_r\}$ such that $\operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_l\}$. Moreover, we set $x_i = \alpha(\pi_P(p_i))$ and $t = \beta(\pi_Q(q_0))$, where $\alpha : M_X \to \mathcal{O}_X$ and $\beta : M_{S,\bar{s}} \to \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}$ are the canonical homomorphisms. Then,

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] = \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_r]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - tX_{l+1}^{b_{l+1}} \cdots X_r^{b_r}),$$

where $b_i = B(p_i)$ and x_i is the class of X_i. Thus, the assertions follow from Lemma 2.4.3 below. □

Lemma 2.4.3. *Let A be a ring. Then, we have the following:*

1. *Let $A[X]$ be the polynomial ring of one variable over A. For a regular element $a \in A$, X is regular in $A[X]/(X^2 - a)$, that is, the multiplication of X in $A[X]/(X^2 - a)$ is injective.*
2. *We assume A is a local ring with the maximal ideal m. Let $A[X_1, \ldots, X_l]$ be the polynomial ring of l-variables over A. For $a \in m$, let us consider a ring R given by $R = A[X_1, \ldots, X_l]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - a)$. If α is a regular element of A, then so is α in R.*

Proof. (1) We assume that $Xf(X) = (X^2 - a)g(X)$ for some $f(X), g(X) \in A[X]$. We set $g(X) = Xh(X) + c$ for some $h(X) \in A[X]$ and $c \in A$. Then,

$$ca = X(h(X)(X^2 - a) + cX - f(X)).$$

Thus, $ca = 0$. Since a is regular, c must be zero. Therefore,

$$Xf(X) = X(X^2 - a)h(X),$$

which implies $f(X) = (X^2 - a)h(X)$ because X is regular in $A[X]$.

(2) Let $\widehat{R}$ be the completion with respect to $(m, X_1, \ldots, X_n)$. Since $R \to \widehat{R}$ is faithfully flat, it is sufficient to see the homomorphism $\widetilde{\alpha} : \widehat{R} \to \widehat{R}$ given by the multiplication of α is injective. Note that $\widehat{R}$ is the direct products of many copies of $\widehat{A}$ by Lemma 1.1.2. Thus, $\widetilde{\alpha}$ is injective. □

2.5. **The support of log structures.** Here we consider the support of log structures. The main result of this subsection is the following proposition:

Proposition 2.5.1. *Let X be a scheme and let M and N be fine log structures on X. Let $h : N \to M$ be a homomorphism of log structures, i.e., a homomorphism of sheaves of monoids with the following diagram commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} N \arrow[rr, "h"] \arrow[dr] & & M \arrow[dl] \\ & \mathcal{O}_X & \end{tikzcd}$$

Then, the set $\{x \in X \mid h_{\bar{x}} : N_{\bar{x}} \to M_{\bar{x}}$ is surjective$\}$ is open.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that if $h_{\bar{x}} : N_{\bar{x}} \to M_{\bar{x}}$ is surjective, then there is an étale neighborhood U of x such that, for all $y \in U$, $h_{\bar{y}} : N_{\bar{y}} \to M_{\bar{y}}$ is surjective. By virtue of [5, (2.8)], for a suitable étale neighborhood U of x, there are finitely generated monoids P and Q together with homomorphisms $\pi : P \to M|_U$, $\mu : Q \to N|_U$ and $f : Q \to P$ such that π and μ give rise to local charts of M and N respectively and the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} Q \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, "\mu"'] & P \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\ N|_U \arrow[r, "h_U"] & M|_U \end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Let $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$ and $\{q_1, \ldots, q_r\}$ be generators of P and Q respectively. Renumbering $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_r$, we may assume that

$$\begin{cases} \pi(p_1), \ldots, \pi(p_{n'}) \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}, \ \pi(p_{n'+1}), \ldots, \pi(p_n) \notin \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}, \\ \mu(q_1), \ldots, \mu(q_{r'}) \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}, \ \mu(q_{r'+1}), \ldots, \mu(q_r) \notin \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}. \end{cases}$$

Let P_0 and Q_0 be submonoids of P and Q generated by $p_1, \ldots, p_{n'}$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_{r'}$ respectively. Here let us see the following:

Claim 2.5.1.1. $\pi_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}) = P_0$ *and* $\mu_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}) = Q_0$.

Clearly, $P_0 \subseteq \pi_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times})$. Conversely, we assume that $w \in \pi_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times})$. We set $w = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_n^{a_n}$. Then,

$$\pi(w) = \pi(p_1)^{a_1} \cdots \pi(p_n)^{a_n} \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}.$$

Therefore, if $a_i > 0$, then $\pi(p_i) \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}$. Hence, $a_i = 0$ for all $i > n'$, which means that $w \in P_0$. In the same way, we can see that $\mu_{\bar{x}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}) = Q_0$.

Claim 2.5.1.2. *For $y \in U$, $h_{\bar{y}} : N_{\bar{y}} \to M_{\bar{y}}$ is surjective if and only if $\bar{h}_{\bar{y}} : \overline{N}_{\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{\bar{y}}$ is surjective.*

Clearly, if $h_{\bar{y}} : N_{\bar{y}} \to M_{\bar{y}}$ is surjective, then so is $\bar{h}_{\bar{y}} : \overline{N}_{\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{\bar{y}}$. Conversely, we assume that $\bar{h}_{\bar{y}} : \overline{N}_{\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{\bar{y}}$ is surjective. Let m be an element of $M_{\bar{y}}$. Then, there is $n \in N_{\bar{y}}$ such that $m \equiv h_{\bar{y}}(n) \mod \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{x}}$, i.e., $m = uh_{\bar{y}}(n)$ for some $u \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}$. Thus, $m = uh_{\bar{y}}(n) = h_{\bar{y}}(un)$.

Shrinking U if necessarily, we may assume that

$$\pi(p_1), \ldots, \pi(p_{n'}) \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(q_1), \ldots, \mu(q_{r'}) \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}$$

for all $y \in U$. Here let us see that $h_{\bar{y}} : N_{\bar{y}} \to M_{\bar{y}}$ is surjective for all $y \in U$, which is equivalent to show that $\bar{h}_{\bar{y}} : \overline{N}_{\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{\bar{y}}$ is surjective by Claim 2.5.1.2. Note that the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Q \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\mu}_{\bar{y}}"'] & P \arrow[d, "\bar{\pi}_{\bar{y}}"] \\
\overline{N}_{\bar{y}} \arrow[r, "\bar{h}_{\bar{y}}"] & \overline{M}_{\bar{y}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

gives rise to the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Q/\mu_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & P/\pi_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}) \arrow[d] \\
\overline{N}_{\bar{y}} \arrow[r, "\bar{h}_{\bar{y}}"] & \overline{M}_{\bar{y}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that the vertical homomorphisms are bijective (cf. [5] and [6]). Therefore, it is sufficient to see that

$$Q/\mu_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}) \to P/\pi_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}})$$

is surjective. Note that $Q_0 \subseteq \mu_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}})$ and $P_0 \subseteq \pi_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}})$. Thus, we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Q/Q_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & P/P_0 \arrow[d] \\
Q/\mu_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}) \arrow[r] & P/\pi_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here, by Claim 2.5.1.1, $Q/Q_0 \to P/P_0$ is surjective because $\overline{N}_{\bar{x}} \to \overline{M}_{\bar{x}}$ is surjective. Hence, so is $Q/\mu_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}}) \to P/\pi_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{y}})$. □

Corollary 2.5.2. *Let X be a scheme and M a fine log structure on X. Then, the set* $\operatorname{Supp}(M) = \{x \in X \mid M_{\bar{x}}$ *is not trivial*$\}$ *is closed.*

Proof. There is a natural homomorphism $\mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X} \to M$. Thus, this is a consequence of the above proposition. □

Corollary 2.5.3. *Let X and Y be schemes and let M and N be fine log structures on X and Y respectively. Let $(f, h) : (X, M) \to (Y, N)$ be a log morphism. Then, the set*

$$\operatorname{Supp}(M/N) = \{x \in X \mid \ N_{\overline{f(x)}} \times \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{x}} \to M_{\bar{x}} \text{ is not surjective}\}$$

is closed.

Proof. Note that the surjectivity of $N_{\overline{f(x)}} \times \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times} \to M_{\overline{x}}$ is equivalent to the sujectivity of $f^*(N)_{\bar{x}} \to M_{\bar{x}}$. Thus, it follows from Proposition 2.5.1. □

3. Rigidity theorem

First, we would like to define the admissibility of morphisms. Let k be an algebraically closed field, and let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a morphism of algebraic schemes over k. Let Z be a subscheme of X. We say ϕ is admissible with respect to Z if, for any irreducible component X' of X, $\phi(X') \not\subseteq Z$.

Let M_Y and M_k be fine log structures of Y and $\mathrm{Spec}(k)$ respectively, and let $(Y, M_Y) \to (\mathrm{Spec}(k), M_k)$ be a log morphism. Then, as in Corollary 2.5.3, $\mathrm{Supp}(M_Y/M_k)$ is given by

$$\{y \in Y \mid M_k \times \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}^{\times} \to M_{Y,\bar{y}} \text{ is not surjective}\}.$$

We say $\phi : X \to Y$ is admissible with respect to M_Y/M_k if $\phi : X \to Y$ is admissible with respect to $\mathrm{Supp}(M_Y/M_k)$.

In general, let $X \to S$ and $Y \to S$ be schemes of finite type over a locally noetherian scheme S, and let M_Y and M_S be fine log structures of Y and S. Let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a morphism over S. For a point $s \in S$, we say $\phi : X \to Y$ is admissible over s with respect to M_Y/M_S, if $\phi_{\bar{s}} : X_{\bar{s}} \to Y_{\bar{s}}$ is admissible with respect to $(M_Y|_{Y_{\bar{s}}})/(M_S|_{\bar{s}})$, where $X_{\bar{s}}$ and $Y_{\bar{s}}$ are the geometric fibers of X and Y over s. If $\phi : X \to Y$ is admissible over any points of S with respect to M_Y/M_S, then ϕ is said to be admissible with respect to M_Y/M_S.

The following theorem is one of the main theorems of this paper.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X, Y and S be locally noetherian schemes, and let M_X, M_Y and M_S be fine log structures of X, Y and S respectively. Let $(X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$ and $(Y, M_Y) \to (S, M_S)$ be integral and log smooth morphisms, and let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a morphism over S. Let us fix a point $s \in S$. We assume that the geometric fibers $X_{\bar{s}}$ and $Y_{\bar{s}}$ over s are semistable varieties and that $\phi : X \to Y$ is admissible over s with respect to M_Y/M_S. If*

$$(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y) \quad \textit{and} \quad (\phi, h') : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

are extensions of $\phi : X \to Y$ as log morphisms over (S, M_S), then, for all closed points x lying over s, $h_{\bar{x}} = h'_{\bar{x}}$ as homomorphisms $M_{Y,\overline{\phi(x)}} \to M_{X,\bar{x}}$ of the germs of étale topology.

Proof. Since this is a local problem, we may assume that $S = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ for a noetherian local ring (A, m). Let $\rho : (A, m) \to (B, n)$ be a local homomorphism of local rings such that B/n is algebraic over A/m. We denote the closed point of S by s and the closed point of $S' = \mathrm{Spec}(B)$ by s'. We set $X' = X \times_S S'$, $Y' = Y \times_S S'$, $M'_X = \pi_X^*(M_X)$, $M_{Y'} = \pi_Y^*(M_Y)$, and $M_{S'} = \pi_S^*(M_S)$, where $\pi_X : X' \to X$, $\pi_Y : Y' \to Y$ and $\pi_S : S' \to S$ are the canonical morphisms.

$$\begin{tikzcd} X' \arrow[r, "\pi_X"] \arrow[d, "\phi_{S'}"'] & X \arrow[d, "\phi"] \\ Y' \arrow[r, "\pi_Y"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

Then, we have log morphisms

$$(\phi_{S'}, h_{S'}), (\phi_{S'}, h'_{S'}) : (X', M_{X'}) \to (Y', M_{Y'})$$

over $(S', M_{S'})$.

Claim 3.1.1. *If ρ is flat and $h_{S',\bar{x}'} = h'_{S',\bar{x}'}$ for all closed points x' lying over s', then $h_{\bar{x}} = h'_{\bar{x}}$ for all closed points x lying over s.*

Let us choose a closed point $x \in X$ over s. Then, there is a $x' \in X'$ such that $\pi_X(x') = x$ and x' is lying over s'. If we set $y = \phi(x)$ and $y' = \phi_{S'}(x')$, then $\pi_Y(y') = y$. Here we consider the natural commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{M}_{Y,\bar{y}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, shift right, "\bar{h}_{\bar{x}}"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "\bar{h}'_{\bar{x}}"] & \overline{M}_{Y',\bar{y}'} \arrow[d, "\bar{h}_{S',\bar{x}'} = \bar{h}'_{S',\bar{x}'}"] \\
\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}} \arrow[r] & \overline{M}_{X',\bar{x}'}
\end{tikzcd}$$

By Lemma 2.4.2, $\overline{M}_{Y,\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{Y',\bar{y}'}$ and $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}} \to \overline{M}_{X',\bar{x}'}$ are bijective. Thus, we can see that $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}} = \bar{h}'_{\bar{x}}$. Let us pick up $w \in M_{Y,\bar{y}}$. Then, since $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}} = \bar{h}'_{\bar{x}}$, there is $u \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}_{X,\bar{x}}$ with $h_{\bar{x}}(w) = h_{\bar{x}}(w) \cdot u$. Here $h_{S',\bar{x}'} = h'_{S',\bar{x}'}$. Thus, u must be 1 in $\mathcal{O}_{X',\bar{x}'}$. Note that $\mathcal{O}_{X',\bar{x}'}$ is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$. Therefore, u is the identity in $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$.

Let I be an ideal of A with $I^2 = \{0\}$, and $B = A/I$. Next we consider a case where ρ is given by the natural homomorphism $A \to B$.

Claim 3.1.2. *We assume that $k = A/m$ is algebraically closed and there are a fine and sharp monoid Q and a homomorphism $\pi_Q : Q \to M_{S,s}$ such that $Q \to M_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is bijective. If $h_{S',\bar{x}'} = h'_{S',\bar{x}'}$ for all closed points x' lying over s', then $h_{\bar{x}} = h'_{\bar{x}}$ for all closed points x lying over s.*

Let x be a closed point of X lying over s, and $y = \phi(x)$. First of all, by [6], there are finite and sharp monoids P and P' and homomorphisms $P \to M_{X,\bar{x}}$, $Q \to P$, $P' \to M_{Y,\bar{y}}$, $Q \to P'$ with the following properties:

(1) The induced homomorphisms $P \to M_{X,\bar{x}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $P' \to M_{Y,\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{Y,\bar{y}}$ are bijective.

(2) The following diagrams are commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Q \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d] & P \arrow[d] & Q \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d] & P' \arrow[d] \\
M_{S,\bar{s}} \arrow[r] & M_{X,\bar{x}}, & M_{S,\bar{s}} \arrow[r] & M_{Y,\bar{y}}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

(3) There are étale neighborhoods (U, x') and (V, y') of x and y such that $P \to M_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $P' \to M_{Y,\bar{y}}$ are defined over U and V respectively, and that the natural morphisms

$$U \to \operatorname{Spec}(A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P]) \quad \text{and} \quad V \to \operatorname{Spec}(A \otimes_{A[Q']} A[P'])$$

are smooth at x' and y' respectively.

Clearly we may assume that P, P' and Q are submonoids of $M_{X,\bar{x}}$, $M_{Y,\bar{y}}$ and $M_{S,\bar{s}}$ respectively. Moreover, by Lemma 3.3 below, the admissibility of ϕ_s guarantees that for any irreducible components T of U_s, $\phi_s(T) \nsubseteq \operatorname{Supp}(M_{V_s}/M_k)$, where U_s and V_s are fibers of $U \to S$ and $V \to S$ over s.

Let σ (resp. σ') be the set of all irreducible elements of P not lying in $f(Q)$ (resp. the set of all irreducible elements of P' not lying in $f'(Q)$). For $j \in \sigma$ and $i \in \sigma'$, we denote $\alpha(j)$ by x_j and $\alpha'(i)$ by y_i, where $\alpha : M_{X,\bar{x}} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $\alpha' : M_{Y,\bar{y}} \to \mathcal{O}_{Y,\bar{y}}$ are the canonical homomorphisms. Moreover, $x_j|_{U_s}$ and $y_i|_{V_s}$ are denoted by x_{js} and y_{is} respectively. Let us consider h and h' on the geometric fibers $X_{\bar{s}}$ and $Y_{\bar{s}}$ over s. Using Lemma 2.4.2 and [6, Theorem 4.1], $\bar{h}_x = \bar{h}'_x$ as $P' \to P$. Thus, we can set as follows:

$$h(i) = u_i \cdot (I_i \cdot \sigma + f(q_i)) \quad \text{and} \quad h'(i) = u'_i \cdot (I_i \cdot \sigma + f(q_i)), \tag{3.1.3}$$

where $q_i \in Q$, $I_i \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$ and $u_i, u'_i \in \mathcal{O}^\times_{X,\bar{x}}$. Then, we have

$$\phi^*(y_i) = f^*(\beta(q_i)) \cdot x^{I_i} \cdot u_i = f^*(\beta(q_i)) \cdot x^{I_i} \cdot u'_i, \tag{3.1.4}$$

where $\beta : M_{S,\bar{s}} \to \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is the canonical homomorphism. Here we consider the following cases:

(A) $f : Q \to P$ splits and $f' : Q \to P'$ splits.
(B) $f : Q \to P$ does not split and $f' : Q \to P'$ splits.
(C) $f : Q \to P$ splits and $f' : Q \to P'$ does not split.
(D) $f : Q \to P$ does not split and $f' : Q \to P'$ does not split.

(Case A): In this case, there are submonoids N and N' of P and P' respectively such that $P = f(Q) \times N$ and $P' = f'(Q) \times N'$. Note that σ and σ' are nothing more than the set of all irreducible elements of N and N' respectively. Then, by the local structure theorem,

$$\mathrm{Supp}(M_{Y_s}/M_k) = \bigcup_{i \in \sigma'} \{y_{is} = 0\}.$$

around $\bar{y}$ on Y_s. Thus, using the admissibility of ϕ_s, $\phi_s^*(y_{is}) \neq 0$. Hence, we can see that $q_i = 0$ for all $i \in \sigma'$. Therefore,

$$x^{I_i} \cdot u_i = x^{I_i} \cdot u'_i$$

for all $i \in \sigma'$. Here, x_j's are regular elements. Therefore, $u_i = u'_i$ for all $i \in \sigma'$.

(Case B): In this case, there is a submonoid N' of P' such that $P' = f'(Q) \times N'$. Moreover, P is of semistable type

$$(\sigma, q_0, \Delta, B)$$

over Q for some $q_0 \in Q$ and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$. By the local structure theorem,

$$\mathrm{Supp}(M_{Y_s}/M_k) = \bigcup_{i \in \sigma'} \{y_{is} = 0\}$$

around $\bar{y}$ on Y_s. Thus, by the admissibility of ϕ_s $\phi_s^*(y_{is}) \neq 0$, which implies that $q_i = 0$ for all $i \in \sigma'$. Hence,

$$x^{I_i} \cdot u_i = x^{I_i} \cdot u'_i$$

for all $i \in \sigma'$. By virtue of the admissibility of ϕ_s again, we can see that $\mathrm{Supp}(I_i) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) = \emptyset$. Thus, x^{I_i}'s are regular elements. Therefore, $u_i = u'_i$ for all $i \in \sigma'$.

(Case C): In this case, there is a submonoid N of P with $P = f(Q) \times N$. P' is of semistable type

$$(\sigma', q'_0, \Delta', B')$$

over Q for some $q'_0 \in Q$ and $\Delta', B' \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma'}$. Note that

$$\mathrm{Supp}(M_{Y_s}/M_k) = \mathrm{Sing}(Y_s) \cup \bigcup_{i \in \sigma' \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')} \{y_{is} = 0\}.$$

around $\bar{y}$ on Y_s.

Let us see that if $\phi_s^*(y_{is}) \neq 0$ for some $i \in \sigma'$, then $u_i = u'_i$. Indeed, we have $q_i = 0$. Thus,

$$x^{I_i} \cdot u_i = x^{I_i} \cdot u'_i.$$

for all $i \in \sigma'$. Here, x^{I_i}'s are regular elements. Hence, $u_i = u'_i$.

Therefore, we may assume that there is $i \in \sigma'$ with $\phi_s^*(y_{is}) = 0$. Then, by the admissibility of ϕ_s, there is i_0 such that $\phi_s^*(y_{is}) \neq 0$ for all $i \in \sigma' \setminus \{i_0\}$. Note that $i_0 \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')$. Then, $u_i = u'_i$ for all $i \in \sigma' \setminus \{i_0\}$. Let us consider a relation

$$\Delta' \cdot \sigma' = f'(q'_0) + B' \cdot \sigma'.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')} h(i) = f(q'_0) + \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(B')} B'(i)h(i) \\ \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')} h'(i) = f(q'_0) + \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(B')} B'(i)h'(i) \end{cases}$$

Here $h(i) = h'(i)$ for all $i \neq i_0$. Thus, we can see that $h(i_0) = h'(i_0)$.

(Case D): In the final case, P and P' are of semistable type

$$(\sigma, q_0, \Delta, B) \quad \text{and} \quad (\sigma', q'_0, \Delta', B')$$

over Q for some $q_0, q'_0 \in Q$, $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$ and $\Delta', B' \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma'}$. For $j \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)$ and $i \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')$, let U_{js} and V_{is} be the irreducible components of U_s and V_s given by $x_{js} = 0$ and $y_{is} = 0$ respectively. By the admissibility of ϕ_s, for each $j \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)$, there is a unique $i \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')$ with $\phi_s(U_{js}) \subseteq V_{is}$. This i is denoted by $\mu(j)$. Note that

$$\operatorname{Supp}(M_{Y_s}/M_k) = \operatorname{Sing}(Y_s) \cup \bigcup_{i \in \sigma' \setminus \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')} \{y_{is} = 0\}$$

around $\bar{y}$ on Y_s. Therefore, if $i \neq \mu(j)$, then $\phi^*(y_i)|_{U_j} \neq 0$. Thus, we can see $q_i = 0$ for $i \neq \mu(j)$.

First of all, let us see that $q_i = 0$ and $u_i = u'_i$ for all $i \in \sigma' \setminus \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')$. By the previous observation, $q_i = 0$. Thus,

$$x^{I_i} \cdot u_i = x^{I_i} \cdot u'_i.$$

By using the admissibility of ϕ_s, we can see that $\operatorname{Supp}(I_i) \cap \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) = \emptyset$. Thus, x^{I_i} is a regular element. Therefore, $u_i = u'_i$.

Here, we consider the case where $\mu(\operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)) = \{i_0\}$. Then, for $i \neq i_0$, $q_i = 0$. Thus,

$$x^{I_i} \cdot u_i = x^{I_i} \cdot u'_i.$$

By virtue of the admissibility of ϕ_s, $\operatorname{Supp}(I_i) \cap \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) = \emptyset$. Hence, x^{I_i} is a regular element. Therefore, $u_i = u'_i$. Let us consider a relation

$$\Delta' \cdot \sigma' = f'(q'_0) + B' \cdot \sigma'.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')} h(i) = f(q'_0) + \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(B')} B'(i)h(i) \\ \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta')} h'(i) = f(q'_0) + \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Supp}(B')} B'(i)h'(i) \end{cases}$$

Since $h(i) = h'(i)$ for all $i \neq i_0$, we can see that $h(i_0) = h'(i_0)$.

Finally, let us consider the case where $\#\mu(\operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)) \geq 2$. In this case, $q_i = 0$ for all $i \in \sigma'$. Thus,

$$x^{I_i} \cdot u_i = x^{I_i} \cdot u'_i.$$

By our assumption, $u_i \equiv u'_i \mod I\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$. Note that x_j ($j \notin \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$) is regular. Thus, if we set $I'_i = I_i|_{\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)}$, then

$$x^{I'_i} \cdot u_i = x^{I'_i} \cdot u'_i$$

for all $i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')$. Moreover, by the admissibility of ϕ_s, $\mathrm{Supp}(I'_i) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(I'_{i'}) = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq i'$. Further, let us consider a relation

$$\Delta' \cdot \sigma' = f'(q'_0) + B' \cdot \sigma'.$$

Since $h(i) = h'(i)$ for all $\sigma' \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')} h(i) = \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')} h'(i).$$

Thus, $\prod_{i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')} u_i = \prod_{i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')} u'_i$. Here we set $v_i = u_i/u'_i$ for $i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta)$. Then, gathering the above observations, we have seen that

$$\begin{cases} x^{I'_i} = x^{I'_i} \cdot v_i \text{ for all } i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta'), \\ v_i \equiv 1 \mod I\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}} \text{ for all } i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta'), \\ \prod_{i \in \mathrm{Supp}(\Delta')} v_i = 1, \\ \mathrm{Supp}(I'_i) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(I'_{i'}) = \emptyset \text{ for all } i \neq i'. \end{cases}$$

Since $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P] \to \mathcal{O}_{U,u}$ is smooth, $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P \times \mathbb{N}^e] \to \mathcal{O}_{U,x'}$ is étale for some $e \geq 0$. Let o be the origin of $\mathrm{Spec}(A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P \times \mathbb{N}^e])$. Then, the residue field of $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P \times \mathbb{N}^e]$ at o is k. Moreover, the residue fields of $\mathcal{O}_{U,x'}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ are k because k is algebraically closed. Therefore, the completion of $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P \times \mathbb{N}^e]$ at o is isomorphic to the completion of $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$. Thus, by Lemma 3.4 below, $v_i = 1$, that is, $u_i = u'_i$ for all i.

Let $k = A/m$ and $\bar{k}$ the algebraic closure of k. By virtue of [EGA III, Chapter 0, 10.3.1], there are a noetherian local ring (B, n) and a local homomorphism $A \to B$ such that $mB = n$, B/n is isomorphic to $\bar{k}$ over $k = A/m$ and that B is flat over A. Thus, by Claim 3.1.1, we may assume that the residue field $k = A/m$ is algebraically closed. Moreover, by Proposition 2.3.1, we may further assume that there are a find and sharp monoid Q and a homomorphism $\pi_Q : Q \to M_{S,s}$ such that $Q \to M_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is bijective.

Let $A_i = A/m^{i+1}$, $\rho_i : A_i \to A_{i-1}$ the canonical homomorphism and $I_i = \mathrm{Ker}(\rho_i)$. Then, $A_0 = k$ and $I_i^2 = \{0\}$ for $i \geq 1$. We set $X_i = X \times_S \mathrm{Spec}(A_i)$, $M_{X_i} = M_X|_{X_i}$, $Y_i = Y \times_S \mathrm{Spec}(A_i)$, $M_{Y_i} = M_Y|_{Y_i}$. Moreover, the induced morphisms $M_{Y_i} \to M_{X_i}$ and $M_{Y_i} \to M_{X_i}$ via h and h' are denoted by h_i and h'_i respectively. Note that $h_0 = h'_0$ at closed points of X_s by [6]. Moreover, by Claim 3.1.2, $h_n = h_n$ at closed points lying over s implies that $h_{n+1} = h'_{n+1}$ at closed points lying over s. Therefore, we have $h_n = h'_n$ at closed points of X_s for all $n \geq 0$. Let x be a closed point of X over s and $y = \phi(x)$. Since $\bar{h}_{\bar{x}} = \bar{h}'_{\bar{x}}$ as a homomorphism $\overline{M}_{Y,\bar{y}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$, for $w \in M_{Y,\bar{y}}$, there is $u \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}$ with $h_{\bar{x}}(w) = h'_{\bar{x}}(w) \cdot u$. Since $h_n = h'_n$, we can see that $u - 1 \in m^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$. Note that $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is noetherian, which implies that $\bigcap_{n=0} m^{n+1}\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}} = \{0\}$. Therefore, $u = 1$. □

As corollary of Theorem 3.1, we have the following:

Corollary 3.2 (Rigidity theorem). *Let $f : X \to S$ and $g : Y \to S$ be semistable schemes over a locally noetherian scheme S, and let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a morphism over S. Let M_X, M_Y and M_S be fine log structures on X, Y and S respectively. We assume that (X, M_X) and (Y, M_Y) are log smooth and integral over (S, M_S) and ϕ is admissible with respect to M_Y/M_S. If we have log morphisms*

$$(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y) \quad \text{and} \quad (\phi, h') : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

over (S, M_S) as extensions of $\phi : X \to Y$, then $h = h'$.

The following two lemmas was needed for the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. *Let*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X' \arrow[r, "\pi'"] \arrow[d, "\mu"'] & Y' \arrow[d, "\nu"] \\ X \arrow[r, "\pi"] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

be a commutative diagram of reduced algebraic schemes over an algebraically closed field such that X and X' is equi-dimensional and μ is flat. Let Z be a closed subset of Y. If $\pi(T) \not\subseteq Z$ for any irreducible components T of X, then $\pi'(T') \not\subseteq \nu^{-1}(Z)$ for any irreducible components T' of X'.

Proof. We assume that $\pi'(T') \subseteq \nu^{-1}(Z)$ for an irreducible component T' of X'. Then,

$$\pi(\mu(T')) = \nu(\pi'(T')) \subseteq \nu(\nu^{-1}(Z)) \subseteq Z.$$

Let T be the Zariski closure of $\mu(T')$. If $\dim T < \dim X$, then

$$\dim \mu^{-1}(x) \geq \dim T' - \dim T > \dim X' - \dim X$$

for $x \in \mu(T')$, which is a contradiction because μ is flat. Thus, we have $\dim T = \dim X$, which means that T is an irreducible component of X. On the other hand, we know $\pi(T) \subseteq Z$. This is contradict to our assumption. Therefore, we get our lemma. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let (A, m) be a noetherian complete local ring and $A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ the ring of formal power series of n-variables over A. For a fixed $a \in m$, let*

$$R = A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]/(X_1 \cdots X_n - a)$$

and J an ideal of R with $J^2 = 0$. Let $u_1, \ldots u_l$ be elements of R and $I_1, \ldots, I_l$ elements of $\mathbb{N}^n$ with $\operatorname{Supp}(I_i) \cap \operatorname{Supp}(I_j) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. We assume that (1) $u_1 \cdots u_l = 1$, (2) $X^{I_i} u_i = X^{I_i}$ in R for all i, and that (3) $u_i \equiv 1 \mod J$. Then, we have $u_1 = \cdots = u_l = 1$.

Proof. We set $\Sigma = \{I \in \mathbb{N}^n \mid \Delta \not\leq I\}$ and

$$A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]_\Sigma = \left\{ \sum_{I \in \Sigma} a_I X^I \mid a_I \in A \right\},$$

where $\Delta = (1, \ldots, 1)$. Then, by Lemma 1.1.2, the natural map $A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]_\Sigma \to R$ is bijective. Here we claim the following:

Claim 3.4.1. *Let T be an element of $\mathbb{N}^n$. We set $\Sigma_T = \{I \in \Sigma \mid I + T \geq \Delta\}$. Then, for $f \in A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]_\Sigma$, if $X^T f = 0$ in R, then f can be written by a form*

$$f = \sum_{I \in \Sigma_T} b_I X^I.$$

If either $T = (0, \ldots, 0)$ or $T \geq \Delta$, then our assertion is trivial. Thus, we may assume that $T \neq (0, \ldots, 0)$ and $T \not\geq \Delta$. For $I \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we can find a non-negative integer a and $J \in \Sigma$ with $I = a\Delta + J$. We denote a and J by $a(I)$ and $J(I)$ respectively. Here let us see that $J(I+T) \notin \{S + T \mid S \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_T\}$ for $I \in \Sigma_T$. Indeed, since $I \in \Sigma_T$, we can find i with $I(i) = 0$ and $T(i) > 0$. Thus,

$$J(I+T)(i) = T(i) - a(I+T) < T(i).$$

Hence $J(I+T) \notin \{S + T \mid S \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_T\}$.

Here we set $f = \sum_{I \in \Sigma} a_I X^I$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} X^T f &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma_T} a_I X^{I+T} + \sum_{I \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_T} a_I X^{I+T} \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma_T} a_I a^{a(I+T)} X^{J(I+T)} + \sum_{I \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_T} a_I X^{I+T}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $a_I = 0$ for $I \in \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_T$.

Since $u_i \equiv 1 \mod J$, there is $a_i \in J$ with $u_i = 1 + a_i$. Then, $X^{I_i} a_i = 0$. Moreover, since $J^2 = 0$,

$$u_1 \cdots u_l = 1 + a_1 + \cdots + a_l = 1.$$

Hence $a_1 + \cdots + a_l = 0$. Since $X^{I_i} a_i = 0$, by the above claim, $a_i = \sum_{I \in \Sigma_{I_i}} c_{i,I} X^I$, where $\Sigma_{I_i} = \{I \in \Sigma \mid I + I_i \geq \Delta\}$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{I \in \Sigma_{I_i}} c_{i,I} X^I = 0.$$

Note that if $I \in \Sigma_{I_i}$ and $I' \in \Sigma_{I_j}$ for $i \neq j$, then $I \neq I'$ because $\operatorname{Supp}(I_i) \cap \operatorname{Supp}(I_j) = \emptyset$. Thus, we can see that $c_{i,I} = 0$, which shows us $a_i = 0$ for all i. □

4. Descent of log morphisms

Let A be a ring. Note that A gives rise to the commutative monoid $(A, \times)$ with respect to the multiplication. *A pre-log monoid over A* is a monoid M together with a homomorphism $\alpha : M \to (A, \times)$. Moreover, a pre-log monoid $\alpha : M \to (A, \times)$ over A is called *a log monoid* if α induces an isomorphism $\alpha^{-1}(A^\times) \xrightarrow{\sim} A^\times$. We often identify $\alpha^{-1}(A^\times)$ with $A^\times$. First, let us see the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let A be a ring and $\alpha : M \to (A, \times)$ a pre-log monoid over A. Then, we have the following:*

1. *A homomorphism $\alpha' : M \boxplus_{\alpha^{-1}(A^\times)} A^\times \to A$ given by $\alpha'(m, a) = \alpha(m)a$ is well-defined.*
2. *$(\alpha')^{-1}(A^\times) \xrightarrow{\sim} A^\times$, that is, $\alpha' : M \boxplus_{\alpha^{-1}(A^\times)} A^\times \to A$ is a log monoid over A.*

The log monoid $\alpha' : M \boxplus_{\alpha^{-1}(A^\times)} A^\times \to A$ as above is called the associated log monoid of $\alpha : M \to A$.

Proof. (1) This is obvious because the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\alpha^{-1}(A^{\times}) \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[d] & A^{\times} \arrow[d] \\
M \arrow[r, "\alpha"] & A
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

(2) If the class of (m, a) belongs to $(\alpha')^{-1}(A^{\times})$, then it is easy to see that $(m, a) \sim (1, \alpha(m)a)$. Moreover, if $(1, a) \sim (1, a')$, then $a = a'$. Thus, we get our assertion. □

Let $\alpha : M \to A$ be a pre-log monoid over A and $f : A \to B$ a homomorphism of rings. The associated log monoid $M \boxplus_{(f\circ\alpha)^{-1}(B^{\times})} B^{\times}$ of $f \circ \alpha : M \to (B, \times)$ is denoted by $M \boxtimes_A B$ and the canonical homomorphism $M \boxtimes_A B \to B$ is denoted by α_B, that is, $\alpha_B(m, b) = f(\alpha(m))b$. Note that the associated log monoid of $\alpha : M \to A$ is nothing more than $M \boxtimes_A A$.

We say f is *quasi-local* if $f^{-1}(B^{\times}) = A^{\times}$. Note that a local homomorphism of local rings is quasi-local. More generally, if, for any maximal ideal m of A, there is a maximal ideal n of B with $f^{-1}(n) = m$, then f is quasi-local. If M is a log monoid over A and $f : A \to B$ is quasi-local, then $M \boxtimes_A B = M \boxplus_{A^{\times}} B^{\times}$, namely, $(m, b) \sim (m', b')$ if and only if there is $a \in A^{\times}$ with $(m, b)(a, f(a^{-1})) = (m', b')$.

Let $\beta : N \to A$ be another pre-log monoid over A. A homomorphism $\phi : M \to N$ is called a homomorphism over A if $\alpha = \beta \circ \phi$, i.e., the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[rr, "\phi"] \arrow[dr, "\alpha"'] & & N \arrow[dl, "\beta"] \\
& A &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that if $\alpha : M \to A$ and $\beta : N \to A$ are log monids over A, and ϕ is a homomorphism over A, then $\phi(am) = a\phi(m)$ for all $m \in M$ and $a \in A^{\times}$. We denote the set of all homomorphisms $M \to N$ over A by $\operatorname{Hom}_A(M, N)$.

More generally, let $f : A \to B$ be a homomorphism of rings and let $\alpha : M \to A$ and $\beta : N \to B$ be pre-log monoids over A and B respectively. Then, a homomorphism $\phi : M \to N$ is called a homomorphism over f if $f \circ \alpha = \beta \circ \phi$, i.e., the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[r, "\phi"] \arrow[d, "\alpha"'] & N \arrow[d, "\beta"] \\
A \arrow[r, "f"] & B
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. The set of all homomorphisms $\phi : M \to N$ over f is denoted by $\operatorname{Hom}_f(M, N)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f : A \to B$ be a homomorphism of rings, and let $\alpha : M \to A$ and $\beta : N \to B$ be log monoids over A and B respectively. Then, there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\operatorname{Hom}_f(M, N) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Hom}_B(M \boxtimes_A B, N).$$

Proof. We define

$$\gamma : \operatorname{Hom}_f(M, N) \to \operatorname{Hom}_B(M \boxtimes_A B, N)$$

to be $\gamma(\phi)(m,b) = \phi(m)b$. This is well defined because the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(f \circ \alpha)^{-1}(B^{\times}) \arrow[r, "f\circ\alpha"] \arrow[d] & B^{\times} \arrow[d, "\beta^{-1}"] \\
M \arrow[r, "\phi"] & N
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. We need to see that $\gamma(\phi)$ is a homomorphism over B. Indeed,

$$\beta \circ \gamma(\phi)(m,b) = \beta(\phi(m)b) = \beta(\phi(m))b = f(\alpha(m))b = \alpha_B(m,b).$$

Next, we define

$$\delta : \mathrm{Hom}_B(M \boxtimes_A B, N) \to \mathrm{Hom}_f(M,N)$$

to be $\delta(\phi')(m) = \phi'(m,1)$. Since

$$\beta \circ \delta(\phi')(m) = \beta(\phi'(m,1)) = \alpha_B(m,1) = f \circ \alpha(m),$$

$\delta(\phi')$ is a homomorphism over f.

With this notation,

$$(\delta \circ \gamma)(\phi)(m) = \delta(\gamma(\phi))(m) = \gamma(\phi)(m,1) = \phi(m)$$

and

$$(\gamma \circ \delta)(\phi')(m,b) = \gamma(\delta(\phi'))(m) = \delta(\phi')(m)b = \phi'(m,1)b = \phi'(m,b).$$

Therefore, we get our claim. □

Let $\alpha : M \to A$ and $\beta : N \to A$ be pre-log monoids over A. Let $\phi : M \to N$ be a homomorphism over A and $h : B \to C$ be a homomorphism of A-algebras. Then, there is a homomorphism

$$\phi \boxtimes h : M \boxtimes_A B \to N \boxtimes_A C$$

given by $(\phi \boxtimes h)(m,b) = (\phi(m), h(b))$. This is well-defined. Indeed, let $f : A \to B$ and $g : A \to C$ be the canonical homomorphisms with $h \circ f = g$. Here we consider $\mu : M \to N \boxtimes_A C$ and $\nu : B^{\times} \to N \boxtimes_A C$ given by $\mu(m) = (\phi(m),1)$ and $\nu(b) = (1, h(b))$. Then, for $m \in (f \circ \alpha)^{-1}(B^{\times})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(1, h((f\circ\alpha)(m))) \cdot (\phi(m),1) &= (\phi(m),1) \cdot (1, h(f(\alpha(m)))) \\
&= (\phi(m),1) \cdot (1, g(\alpha(m))) \\
&= (\phi(m),1) \cdot (1, (g \circ \beta)(\phi(m))),
\end{aligned}$$

which means that $(1, h((f\circ\alpha)(m))) \sim (\phi(m),1)$ in $N \boxtimes_A C$. Thus, the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(f \circ \alpha)^{-1}(B^{\times}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & B^{\times} \arrow[d, "\nu"] \\
M \arrow[r, "\mu"] & N \boxtimes_A C
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Therefore, we have the homomorphism $\phi \boxtimes h : M \boxtimes_A B \to N \boxtimes_A C$.

Lemma 4.3 (Descent lemma for log monoids). *Let $f : A \to B$ be a faithfully flat homomorphism of rings. Here we consider the descent exact sequence*

$$0 \to A \xrightarrow{f} B \underset{q}{\overset{p}{\rightrightarrows}} B \otimes_A B,$$

where $p(b) = b \otimes 1$ and $q(b) = 1 \otimes b$. Then, we have the following:

(1) *Let $\alpha : M \to A$ be a log monoid over A such that M is integral. Then, the sequence*

$$0 \to M = M \boxtimes_A A \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f} M \boxtimes_A B \underset{\mathrm{id} \boxtimes q}{\overset{\mathrm{id} \boxtimes p}{\rightrightarrows}} M \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B)$$

is exact.

(2) *Let $\alpha : M \to A$ and $\beta : N \to A$ be log monoids over A such that M and N are integral. Then, the sequence*

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N) \xrightarrow{F} \mathrm{Hom}_B(M \boxtimes_A B, N \boxtimes_A B) \underset{Q}{\overset{P}{\rightrightarrows}} \mathrm{Hom}_{B \otimes_A B}(M \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B), N \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B))$$

induced by the descent exact sequence is exact, where F, P and Q are given as follows: First of all, $F(\phi) = \phi \boxtimes \mathrm{id}$. Note that f, p and q are quasi-local. Thus, using the homomorphism $B^\times \to (B \otimes_A B)^\times$ via p and (5) of Lemma 2.1.1,

$$\begin{cases} M \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B) \xrightarrow{\sim} (M \boxtimes_A B) \boxtimes_B (B \otimes_A B), \\ N \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B) \xrightarrow{\sim} (N \boxtimes_A B) \boxtimes_B (B \otimes_A B). \end{cases}$$

Then, $P(\phi') = \phi' \boxtimes_p \mathrm{id}_{(B \otimes_A B)}$. The subscript p means that we use the homomorphism $B^\times \to (B \otimes_A B)^\times$ in terms of p. In the same way, using the homomorphism $B^\times \to (B \otimes_A B)^\times$ via q, $Q(\phi') = \phi' \boxtimes_q \mathrm{id}_{(B \otimes_A B)}$.

Proof. (1) First, let us see that $M \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f} M \boxtimes_A B$ is injective. Indeed, we assume that $(m, 1) \sim (m', 1)$ in $M \boxtimes_A B$. Then, there is $a \in A^\times$ with $(m, 1)(a, f(a^{-1})) = (m', 1)$ because f is quasi-local. Thus, $f(a) = 1$. Since f is faithfully flat, f is injective. Therefore, $a = 1$. Hence $m = m'$.

It is easy to see that $(\mathrm{id} \boxtimes p) \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f) = (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes q) \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)$.

Finally, we assume $(\mathrm{id} \boxtimes p)(m, b) = (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes q)(m, b)$ for some $m \in M$ and $b \in B^\times$. We set $r = p \circ f = q \circ f$. Then, there is $a \in A^\times$ with $(m, b \otimes 1) \cdot (a, r(a^{-1})) = (m, 1 \otimes b)$ because r is quasi-local. Thus, $ma = m$ and $(b \otimes 1) r(a^{-1}) = 1 \otimes b$. Here since M is integral, $a = 1$. Therefore, $b \otimes 1 = 1 \otimes b$. Hence $b = f(a')$ for some $a' \in A$. Here f is quasi-local. Thus, $a' \in A^\times$. Hence, $(m, b) = (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)(m, a)$ with $a \in A^\times$.

(2) We need to show that, for $\phi' \in \mathrm{Hom}_B(M \boxtimes_A B, N \boxtimes_A B)$, if $P(\phi') = Q(\phi')$, then there is a $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ with $F(\phi) = \phi'$. Since the following diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \boxtimes_A B \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes p"] \arrow[d, "\phi'"] & M \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B) \arrow[d, "P(\phi')"] & M \boxtimes_A B \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes q"] \arrow[d, "\phi'"] & M \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B) \arrow[d, "Q(\phi')"] \\
N \boxtimes_A B \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes p"] & N \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B) & N \boxtimes_A B \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes q"] & N \boxtimes_A (B \otimes_A B)
\end{tikzcd}$$

are commutative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes p) \circ \phi' \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)(m) &= P(\phi') \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes p) \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)(m) \\ &= Q(\phi') \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes q) \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)(m) \\ &= (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes q) \circ \phi' \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)(m). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there is a unique $n \in N$ such that $\phi' \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)(m) = (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f)(n)$. We denote this n by $\phi(m)$. It is easy to see that ϕ is a homomorphism and the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f"] \arrow[d, "\phi"'] & M \boxtimes_A B \arrow[d, "\phi'"] \\
N \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f"] & N \boxtimes_A B.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Finally, let us see that ϕ is a homomorphism over A. Indeed, since ϕ' is a homomorphism over B and the following diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f"] \arrow[d, "\alpha"'] & M \boxtimes_A B \arrow[d, "\alpha_B"] \\
A \arrow[r, "f"] & B
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}
N \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f"] \arrow[d, "\beta"'] & N \boxtimes_A B \arrow[d, "\beta_B"] \\
A \arrow[r, "f"] & B
\end{tikzcd}$$

are commutative,

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ \beta \circ \phi = \beta_B \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f) \circ \phi &= \beta_B \circ \phi' \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f) \\ &= \alpha_B \circ (\mathrm{id} \boxtimes f) = f \circ \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\alpha = \beta \circ \phi$ because f is injective. □

As a consequence of the above descent lemma, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\pi : X' \to X$ be a faithfully flat and quasi-compact morphism of schemes and $X'' = X' \times_X X'$. Let $p : X'' \to X'$ and $q : X'' \to X'$ be the projections to the first factor and the second factor respectively. Let M and N be fine log structures on X, and let $r = \pi \circ p = \pi \circ q$. Then,*

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(M, N) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X'}}(\pi^*(M), \pi^*(N)) \underset{q^*}{\overset{p^*}{\rightrightarrows}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X''}}(r^*(M), r^*(N))$$

is exact.

Proof. Let us begin with the following claim.

Claim 4.4.1. *The map $\pi^* : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(M, N) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X'}}(\pi^*(M), \pi^*(N))$ is injective.*

Let $\phi, \psi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(M, N)$ with $\pi^*(\phi) = \pi^*(\psi)$. Since M and N are fine log structures in the étale topology, it is sufficient to see that $\phi_{\bar{x}} = \psi_{\bar{x}}$ for all $x \in X$. Choose $x' \in X'$ with $\pi(x') = x$. Then, we can see

$$\begin{cases} \pi^*(M)_{\bar{x}'} = M_{\bar{x}} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}} \mathcal{O}_{X',\bar{x}'}, \\ \pi^*(N)_{\bar{x}'} = N_{\bar{x}} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}} \mathcal{O}_{X',\bar{x}'}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the claim follows from Lemma 4.3.

Next we consider the descent problem, namely, if $\phi' \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X'}}(\pi^*(M), \pi^*(N))$ with $p^*(\phi') = q^*(\phi')$, then there is $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(M, N)$ with $\pi^*(\phi) = \phi'$. For this purpose, let us see the following claim:

Claim 4.4.2. *Let $\{\rho_i : U_i \to X\}_{i \in I}$ be an étale covering of X. If the descent problem holds on U_i for each $i \in I$, then so does on X.*

Let $\phi' \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{X'}}(\pi^*(M), \pi^*(N))$ with $p^*(\phi') = q^*(\phi')$. Let $s_i : U_i \times_X U_i \to U_i$ and $t_i : U_i \times_X U_i \to U_i$ be the projection to the first factor and the second factor respectively. We set the induced morphisms as follows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[d, "\pi"] & X'_{U_i} \arrow[l, "\rho'_i"'] \arrow[d, "\pi_i"] & X'_{U_i \times_X U_i} \arrow[l, shift right, "s'_i"'] \arrow[l, shift left, "t'_i"] \arrow[d, "\pi'_i"] \\
X & U_i \arrow[l, "\rho_i"'] & U_i \times_X U_i \arrow[l, shift right, "s_i"'] \arrow[l, shift left, "t_i"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then, by our assumption, for each $i \in I$, there is $\phi_{U_i} \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{U_i}}(M_{U_i}, N_{U_i})$ with $\pi_i^*(\phi_{U_i}) = {\rho'_i}^*(\phi')$. Here

$${\pi'_i}^* s_i^*(\phi_{U_i}) = {s'_i}^* \pi_i^*(\phi_{U_i}) = {s'_i}^* {\rho'_i}^*(\phi') = {t'_i}^* {\rho'_i}^*(\phi') = {t'_i}^* \pi_i^*(\phi_{U_i}) = {\pi'_i}^* t_i^*(\phi_{U_i}).$$

Thus, by the previous claim, $s_i^*(\phi_{U_i}) = t_i^*(\phi_{U_i})$ for each $i \in I$. Since M and N are sheaves on the étale topology, there is $\phi_i \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{V_i}}(M_{V_i}, N_{V_i})$ with $\rho_i^*(\phi_i) = \phi_{U_i}$, where $V_i = \rho_i(U_i)$. Moreover, by the previous claim, $\phi_i|_{V_i \cap V_j} = \phi_j|_{V_i \cap V_j}$. Thus, there is $\phi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(M, N)$ such that $\phi|_{V_i} = \phi_i$ for all $i \in I$.

By the above claims, we may assume that $X = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ for some ring A. Thus, using the quasi-compactness of π and the standard techniques as in the case of modules, we may assume that $X' = \operatorname{Spec}(B)$ for some ring B faithfully flat over A. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3, we have our assertion as in Claim 4.4.1. □

Theorem 4.5. *Let $f : X \to S$ and $g : Y \to S$ be semistable schemes over a locally noetherian scheme S, and let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a morphism over S. Let M_X, M_Y and M_S be fine log structures on X, Y and S respectively. We assume that (X, M_X) and (Y, M_Y) are log smooth and integral over (S, M_S) and ϕ is admissible with respect to M_Y/M_S. Then, we have the following:*

1. *Let $\pi : X' \to X$ be a surjective and smooth morphism. If there is a log morphism $(\phi \circ \pi, h') : (X', \pi^*(M_X)) \to (Y, M_Y)$ over (S, M_S), then it descends to a log morphism $(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$ over (S, M_S).*
2. *Let $\pi : S' \to S$ be a faithfully flat and quasi-compact morphism. Let $X' = X \times_S S'$, $Y' = Y \times_S S'$ and $\phi' = \phi \times_S \operatorname{id}_{S'}$. We set the induced morphisms as follows:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[d, "f"'] & X' \arrow[l, "\pi_X"'] \arrow[d, "f'"] & Y \arrow[d, "g"'] & Y' \arrow[l, "\pi_Y"'] \arrow[d, "g'"] \\
S & S' \arrow[l, "\pi"'] & S & S' \arrow[l, "\pi"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

If there is a log morphism $(\phi', h') : (X', \pi_X^*(M_X)) \to (Y', \pi_Y^*(M_Y))$ over $(S', \pi^*(M_S))$, then it descends to a log morphism $(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$ over (S, M_S).

Proof. In the case of (1), it is easy to see that $f \circ \pi : X' \to S$ is a semistable scheme and $\phi \circ \pi : X' \to Y$ is admissible with respect to $\operatorname{Supp}(M_Y/M_S)$ by Lemma 3.3. Thus, (1) and (2) are consequences of Theorem 3.1, Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 4.2. □

Corollary 4.6. *Let $f : X \to S$ and $g : Y \to S$ be semistable schemes over a locally noetherian scheme S, and let $\phi : X \to Y$ be a morphism over S. Let M_X, M_Y and M_S be fine log structures on X, Y and S respectively. We assume that (X, M_X) and (Y, M_Y) are log smooth and integral over (S, M_S) and ϕ is admissible with respect to M_Y/M_S. Let $\{\pi_i : X_i \to X\}_{i\in I}$ and $\{\mu_j : Y_j \to Y\}_{j\in J}$ be families of smooth morphisms such that $X = \bigcup_{i\in I} \pi_i(X_i)$ and $Y = \bigcup_{j\in J} \mu_j(Y_j)$. We assume that, for each $i \in I$, there are $j \in J$ and a log morphism $(\phi_i, h_i) : (X_i, \pi_i^*(M_X)) \to (Y_j, \mu_j^*(M_Y))$ with the following diagram commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X_i \arrow[r, "\phi_i"] \arrow[d, "\pi_i"'] & Y_j \arrow[d, "\mu_j"] \\
X \arrow[r, "\phi"'] & Y.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then, there is a log morphism

$$(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

as an extension of $\phi : X \to Y$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X_i, \pi_i^*(M_X)) \arrow[r, "(\phi_i,h_i)"] \arrow[d, "(\pi_i,\mathrm{nat})"'] & (Y_j, \mu_j^*(M_Y)) \arrow[d, "(\mu_j,\mathrm{nat})"] \\
(X, M_X) \arrow[r, "(\phi,h)"'] & (Y, M_Y)
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative, where nat *is the natural homomorphism.*

Proof. We set $U_i = \pi_i(X_i)$. Then, by (1) of Theorem 4.5, there is a log morphism

$$(\phi|_{U_i}, h_i') : (U_i, M_X|_{U_i}) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X_i, \pi_i^*(M_X)) \arrow[r, "(\phi_i,h_i)"] \arrow[d, "(\pi_i,\mathrm{nat})"'] & (Y_j, \mu_j^*(M_Y)) \arrow[d, "(\mu_j,\mathrm{nat})"] \\
(U_i, M_X|_{U_i}) \arrow[r, "(\phi|_{U_i},h_i')"'] & (Y, M_Y)
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. By using the rigidity theorem, we can construct

$$(\phi, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$$

such that $(\phi, h)|_{U_i} = (\phi|_{U_i}, h_i')$. □

5. Dualizing sheaves of log semistable schemes

Let $(f, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$ be a morphism of fine log schemes. We say $(f, h) : (X, M_X) \to (Y, M_Y)$ is free (or (X, M_X) is free over (S, M_S)) if, for any $x \in X$, $\mathrm{Coker}(\overline{M}^{gr}_{Y,f(\bar{x})} \to \overline{M}^{gr}_{X,\bar{x}})$ is a free abelian group.

Proposition 5.1. *Let S be a locally noetherian scheme and $f : X \to S$ a semistable scheme over S. Let M_X and M_S be fine log structures of X and S respectively. We assume that (X, M_X) and (Y, M_Y) are free, integral and log smooth over (S, M_S). Let $\omega_{X/S}$ be the dualizing sheaf of $X \to S$. Then, there is the canonical injective homomorphism*

$$\phi : \omega_{X/S} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))$$

with the following properties:

1. *ϕ is the identity on the outside of* $\operatorname{Supp}(M_X/M_S)$.
2. *Let us take the effective Cartier divisor $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}$ with*
$$\phi(\omega_{X/S}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}) = \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S))),$$
that is, $x \in \operatorname{Supp}(\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S})$ if and only if ϕ is not surjective at x. Then, $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}$ is flat over S. ($\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}$ is called the boundary divisor of $(X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$.)
3. *Let x be a closed point of X and $s = f(x)$. We set $Q = \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ and $P = \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$. Let $h : Q \to P$ be the induced homomorphism. Let $\alpha : M_X \to \mathcal{O}_X$ be the canonical homomorphism. Here we define $t_{\bar{x}} \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ as follows:*
   - (3.a) *If $h : Q \to P$ splits, i.e., there is a submonoid N of P with $P = f(Q) \times N$, then*
$$t_{\bar{x}} = \prod_{p \in \operatorname{Irr}(N)} \alpha(\tilde{p}),$$
where $\operatorname{Irr}(N)$ is the set of all irreducible elements of N and $\tilde{p}$'s are elements of $M_{X,\bar{x}}$ with $\tilde{p} \equiv p \mod \mathcal{O}^\times_{X,\bar{x}}$.
   - (3.b) *If $h : Q \to P$ does not split, i.e., $h : Q \to P$ has a semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B) for some $\sigma \subseteq P$, $q_0 \in Q$ and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$, then*
$$t_{\bar{x}} = \prod_{p \in \sigma \setminus \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta)} \alpha(\tilde{p}),$$
where $\tilde{p}$'s are elements of $M_{X,\bar{x}}$ with $\tilde{p} \equiv p \mod \mathcal{O}^\times_{X,\bar{x}}$.

   Then, $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}(-\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}) = t_{\bar{x}}\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$.

Proof. Let us begin with the following lemma:

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\phi : (A, m_A) \to (B, m_B)$ be a homomorphism of noetherian local rings such that ϕ is essentially of finite type and smooth. Let $g_1, \ldots, g_r$ be a regular sequence of B. We set $I = (g_1, \ldots, g_r)$ and $C = B/I$. Note that the dualizing sheaf $\omega_{C/A}$ of C over A is given by*

$$\bigwedge^n \Omega_{B/A} \otimes_B \bigwedge^r (I/I^2)^\vee = \left(\bigwedge^n \Omega_{B/A} \otimes_B C\right) \otimes_C \bigwedge^r (I/I^2)^\vee,$$

where $(I/I^2)^\vee$ is the dual as a C-module. Then, there is the canonical homomorphism

$$c : \bigwedge^{n-r} \Omega_{C/A} \to \omega_{C/A}$$

with the following properties: Let $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in B$ such that $df_1, \ldots, df_n$ form a free basis of $\Omega_{B/A}$. For a subset $S = \{j_{r+1}, \ldots, j_n\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$c(d\bar{f}_{j_{r+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{f}_{j_n}) = \Delta_S \cdot (\bar{g}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{g}_r)^\vee \otimes_C (df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_n),$$

where $\bar{f}_{j_{r+1}}, \ldots, \bar{f}_{j_n}$ *are the classes of* $f_{j_{r+1}}, \ldots, f_{j_n}$ *in* C, $\bar{g}_1, \ldots, \bar{g}_r$ *are the classes of* $g_1, \ldots, g_r$ *in* I/I^2 *and* Δ_S *is given by the following equation:*

$$dg_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dg_r \wedge df_{j_{r+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge df_{j_n} = \Delta_S \cdot (df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_n).$$

We say $\omega_0 = (\bar{g}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{g}_r)^\vee \otimes_C (df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_n)$ *is the basis of* $\omega_{C/A}$ *with respect to* $g_1, \ldots, g_r, f_1, \ldots, f_r$.

Proof. This lemma is essentially proved in [7, Lemma 4.12 in Chapter 6]. Let N be a submodule of $\Omega_{B/A}$ generated by $dg_1, \ldots, dg_r$. Note that $N \otimes_B C$ does not depend on the choice of regular sequences which generate I. Moreover, $(\Omega_{B/A}/N) \otimes_B C = \Omega_{C/A}$. Here, we have a homomorphism

$$\rho : \bigwedge^r N \otimes_B \bigwedge^{n-r} \Omega_{B/A} \to \bigwedge^n \Omega_{B/A}$$

given by $\rho((x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_r) \otimes (x_{r+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_n)) = x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_n$. Since $\bigwedge^{r+1} N = 0$, the above homomorphism induces

$$\bar{\rho} : \bigwedge^r N \otimes_B \bigwedge^{n-r} (\Omega_{B/A}/N) \to \bigwedge^n \Omega_{B/A}.$$

Therefore, by tensoring $\otimes_B C$ and by composing $I/I^2 \to N \otimes_B C$, we get

$$\bar{\rho}_C : \bigwedge^r (I/I^2) \otimes_C \bigwedge^{n-r} \Omega_{C/A} \to \bigwedge^r (N \otimes_B C) \otimes_C \bigwedge^{n-r} \Omega_{C/A} \to \bigwedge^n \Omega_{B/A} \otimes_B C.$$

Thus, $\bar{\rho}_C$ gives rise to the canonical homomorphism

$$c : \bigwedge^{n-r} \Omega_{C/A} \to \left(\bigwedge^n \Omega_{B/A} \otimes_B C \right) \otimes_C \bigwedge^r (I/I^2)^\vee = \omega_{C/A}.$$

Let $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in B$ such that $df_1, \ldots, df_n$ form a free basis of $\Omega_{B/A}$, and let $S = \{j_{r+1}, \ldots, j_n\}$ be a subset of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{\rho}_C((\bar{g}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{g}_r) \otimes (d\bar{f}_{j_{r+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\bar{f}_{j_n})) \\
&\qquad = \rho((dg_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dg_r) \otimes (df_{j_{r+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge df_{j_n})) \otimes 1 \\
&\qquad = (dg_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dg_r \wedge df_{j_{r+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge df_{j_n}) \otimes 1 \\
&\qquad = \Delta_S \cdot (df_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge df_n) \otimes 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get the lemma. □

Let us go back to the proof of Proposition 5.1. We set $X_0 = X \setminus \operatorname{Supp}(M_X/M_S)$. Then, f is smooth on X_0 and the log structure M_X on X_0 is trivial over M_S. Thus, $\omega_{X/S}\big|_{X_0} = \det(\Omega^1_{X_0/S})$ and $\det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))\Big|_{X_0} = \det(\Omega^1_{X_0/S})$. Therefore, we can take the canonical homomorphism

$$\phi_0 : \omega_{X/S}\big|_{X_0} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))\Big|_{X_0}$$

as the identity map, so that our problem is how we can extend the homomorphism ϕ_0 on X. Note that an extension of ϕ is uniquely determined if it exists.

Claim 5.2.1. *Let $g : S' \to S$ be a faithfully flat morphism of schemes. We set $X' = X \times_S S'$ and the induced morphisms as follows:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r, "g'"] \arrow[d, "f'"'] & X \arrow[d, "f"] \\
S' \arrow[r, "g"] & S.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Moreover, we set $M_{S'} = g^*(M_S)$ and $M_{X'} = {g'}^*(M_X)$. If there is an extension

$$\phi' : \omega_{X'/S'} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X'/S'}(\log(M_{X'}/M_{S'})))$$

of

$$\phi'_0 : \omega_{X'/S'}\big|_{X'_0} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X'/S'}(\log(M_{X'}/M_{S'})))\Big|_{X'_0},$$

then ϕ' descends to an extension

$$\phi : \omega_{X/S} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))$$

over X, where $X'_0 = \operatorname{Supp}(M_{X'}/M_{S'}) = {g'}^{-1}(X_0)$. Further, if $\mathcal{B}_{M_{X'}/M_{S'}}$ is flat over S', then so is $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}$ over S.

Let us consider $S'' = S' \times_S S'$ and $X'' = X' \times_X X'$. Let $p : S'' \to S'$ and $p' : X'' \to X'$ (resp. $q : S'' \to S'$ and $q' : X'' \to X'$) be the projections to the first (resp. second) factor:

$$S'' \underset{q}{\overset{p}{\rightrightarrows}} S' \xrightarrow{g} S, \qquad X'' \underset{q'}{\overset{p'}{\rightrightarrows}} X' \xrightarrow{g'} X.$$

We set $\rho = g \circ p = g \circ q$ and $\rho' = g' \circ p' = g' \circ q'$. Note that

$$\begin{cases} \omega_{X'/S'} = {g'}^*(\omega_{X/S}) \\ \det(\Omega^1_{X'/S'}(\log(M_{X'}/M_{S'}))) = {g'}^*(\det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))) \\ \omega_{X''/S''} = {\rho'}^*(\omega_{X/S}) \\ \det(\Omega^1_{X''/S''}(\log(M_{X''}/M_{S''}))) = {\rho'}^*(\det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))). \end{cases}$$

Thus, by virtue of the uniqueness of extension, we can see that ${p'}^*(\phi') = {q'}^*(\phi')$. Hence, by using descent theory, ϕ' descends to an extension

$$\phi : \omega_{X/S} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))$$

over X. Further, by the definition of boundary divisors, $\mathcal{B}_{M_{X'}/M_{S'}} = {g'}^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S})$. Thus, the natural morphism $\mathcal{B}_{M_{X'}/M_{S'}} \to \mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}$ is faithfully flat. Therefore, if $\mathcal{B}_{M_{X'}/M_{S'}}$ is flat over S', then so is $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}$ over S.

Moreover, let us consider one more similar claim:

Claim 5.2.2. *Let $u : U \to X$ be an étale morphism. We set $M_U = u^*(M_X)$. If there is an extension*

$$\phi' : \omega_{U/S} \to \det(\Omega^1_{U/S}(\log(M_U/M_S)))$$

of

$$\phi'_0 : \omega_{U/S}\big|_{U_0} \to \det(\Omega^1_{U/S}(\log(M_U/M_S)))\Big|_{U_0},$$

then ϕ' descends to an extension

$$\phi : \omega_{X/S}\big|_{u(U)} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))\Big|_{u(U)},$$

where $U_0 = u^{-1}(X_0)$. Further, if $\mathcal{B}_{M_U/M_S}$ is flat over S, then so is $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S}\big|_{u(U)}$ over S.

Let $U' = U \times_X U$ and $p : U' \to U$ (resp. $q : U' \to U$) be the projection to the first (resp. second) factor. Note that

$$\begin{cases} \omega_{U/S} = u^*(\omega_{X/S}) \\ \det(\Omega^1_{U/S}(\log(M_U/M_S))) = u^*(\det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))) \\ \omega_{U'/S} = {u'}^*(\omega_{X/S}) \\ \det(\Omega^1_{U'/S}(\log(M_{U'}/M_S))) = {u'}^*(\det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))), \end{cases}$$

where $u' = u \circ p = u \circ q$ and $M_{U'} = {u'}^*(M_X)$. Thus, using the uniqueness of extension and descent theory, we can see our claim in the same way as in the previous claim.

Finally, we claim the following:

Claim 5.2.3. *ϕ_0 extends to $\phi : \omega_{X/S} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))$. Moreover, if we take $t_{\bar{x}}$ as in* (3) *of Proposition* 5.1 *for $x \in X$, then*

$$\phi(\omega_{X/S})_{\bar{x}} = t_{\bar{x}} \det(\Omega^1_{X/S}(\log(M_X/M_S)))_{\bar{x}}$$

and $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}/t_{\bar{x}}\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}$.

Clearly we may assume that $S = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ for some noetherian local ring (A, m). Let x be a closed point of X lying over m. Then, by using Proposition 2.3.1 and [EGA III, Chapter 0, 10.3.1] together with Claim 5.2.1 and Lemma 5.3 below, we may further assume the following:

(i) There is a fine and sharp monoid Q and a homomorphism $\pi_Q : Q \to M_{S,s}$ such that $Q \to M_{S,s} \to \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is bijective.
(ii) $k = A/m$ is algebraically closed and the natural homomorphism A/m to the residue field of X at x is an isomorphism.

Then, we have a good chart of $(X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$ at x, namely, there are a fine and sharp monoid P and homomorphisms $\pi_P : P \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{s}}$ and $h : Q \to P$ such that $P \to M_{X,\bar{x}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is bijective, the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} Q \arrow[r, "h"] \arrow[d, "\pi_Q"'] & P \arrow[d, "\pi_P"] \\ M_{S,\bar{s}} \arrow[r] & M_{X,\bar{x}} \end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative and that the natural homomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$$

is smooth. Note that it is sufficient to construct the extension of ϕ_0 over $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ by Claim 5.2.2.

Here we need to take care of the following two cases because (X, M_X) is free over (S, M_S):

(A) f is smooth at x.

(B) f is not smooth at x and $h : Q \to P$ does not split.

For the case (A), there is a submonoid N of P such that $P = h(Q) \times N$ and N is isomorphic to $\mathbb{N}^a$ for some non-negative integer a. Then,

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[\mathbb{N}^a] = \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_a].$$

Thus, adding more indeterminates $X_{a+1}, \ldots, X_n$, $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is étale over

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_n].$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to see our assertion on $X' = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_n])$ around the origin $o = (m_{S,\bar{s}}, X_1, \ldots, X_n)$. Then, the bases of

$$\omega_{X'/S,\bar{o}} \quad \text{and} \quad \det(\Omega^1_{X'/S}(\log(M_{X'}/M_S))_{\bar{o}}$$

are

$$dX_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_n \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dX_1}{X_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{dX_a}{X_a} \wedge dX_{a+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_n$$

respectively. Hence, we get the first and second assertions. Moreover, in this case, $t_{\bar{x}} = X_1 \cdots X_a$. Thus, the last assertion follows from Remark 1.1.3.

Finally, we consider the case (B). Here we set $\sigma = \{p_1, \ldots, p_r\}$ with $\operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) = \{p_1, \ldots, p_l\}$. Then, $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is étale over

$$O_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_l, X_{l+1}, \ldots, X_r, X_{r+1} \ldots, X_n]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - aX_{l+1}^{b_{l+1}} \cdots X_r^{b_r}),$$

where the class of X_i $(i = 1, \ldots, l)$ is $\alpha(\pi_P(p_i))$, $b_j = B(p_j)$ $(j = l+1, \ldots, r)$ and $a = \alpha(\pi_Q(q_0))$. We denote the class of X_i by x_i. Moreover, the polynomial $X_1 \cdots X_l - aX_{l+1}^{b_{l+1}} \cdots X_r^{b_r}$ is denoted by F. As in the case (A), it is sufficient to see our assertion on $X' = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(F))$ around the origin $o = (m_{S,\bar{s}}, X_1, \ldots, X_n)$. Here we set

$$\omega_i = \begin{cases} d\log(p_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{d\log(p_i)} \wedge \cdots \wedge d\log(p_r) \wedge dx_{r+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n & \text{if } 1 \le i \le r \\ d\log(p_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge d\log(p_r) \wedge dx_{r+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n & \text{if } r < i \le n \end{cases}$$

as an element of $\det(\Omega^1_{X'/S}(\log(M_{X'}/M_S))$. Then, it is easy to see that

$$\omega_i = \begin{cases} (-1)^{i-1}\omega_1 & \text{if } 1 \le i \le l \\ (-1)^i b_i \omega_1 & \text{if } l < i \le r \\ 0 & \text{if } r < i \le n \end{cases}$$

because

$$d\log(p_1) + \cdots + d\log(p_l) = b_{l+1} d\log(p_{l+1}) + \cdots + b_r d\log(p_r).$$

Let

$$\lambda = (\overline{F})^\vee \otimes dX_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_n|_{X_0} \in ((F)/(F^2))^\vee \otimes \det(\Omega^1_{\mathbb{A}_S/S})\Big|_{X'}$$

be the basis of $\omega_{X'/S}$ with respect to $F, X_1, \ldots, X_n$ as in Lemma 5.2, and let

$$\phi : \omega_{X'/S} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X'/S}(\log(M_{X'}/M_S))$$

be a homomorphism given by $\phi(\lambda) = x_{l+1} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_1$. Moreover, let

$$c : \bigwedge^{n-1} \Omega^1_{X'/S} \to \omega_{X'/S}$$

be the canonical homomorphism described in Lemma 5.2 and let

$$c' : \bigwedge^{n-1} \Omega^1_{X'/S} \to \det(\Omega^1_{X'/S}(\log(M_{X'}/M_S))$$

be the natural homomorphism. More precisely, c is given by

$$c(dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n) = \Delta_i \cdot \lambda,$$

where Δ_i is determined by

$$dF \wedge dX_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dX_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_n = \Delta_i \cdot dX_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dX_n.$$

Thus, $\Delta_i = (-1)^{i-1}(\partial F/\partial X_i)$. In order to see our assertion, it is sufficient to show that the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \det(\Omega^1_{X'/S}(\log(M_{X'}/M_S)) \\
\bigwedge^{n-1}\Omega^1_{X'/S} \arrow[ur, "c'"] \arrow[dr, "c"'] & \\
 & \omega_{X'/S} \arrow[uu, "\phi"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Indeed, $\bigwedge^{n-1}\Omega^1_{X'/S}$ is generated by $\{dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots dx_n\}_{i=1}^n$. Thus, we need to see that

$$\phi(c(dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots dx_n)) = x_1 \cdots \widehat{x_i} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_i$$

for all i. In the case where $1 \leq i \leq l$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(c(dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots dx_n)) &= \beta((-1)^{i-1}(\partial F/\partial X_i)\lambda) \\
&= (-1)^{i-1} x_1 \cdots \widehat{x_i} \cdots x_l \cdot x_{l+1} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_1 \\
&= x_1 \cdots \widehat{x_i} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_i.
\end{aligned}$$

In the case where $l < j \leq r$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(c(dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots dx_n)) &= \beta((-1)^{i-1}(\partial F/\partial X_i)\lambda) \\
&= (-1)^i b_i a x_{l+1}^{b_{l+1}} \cdots x_i^{b_i - 1} \cdots x_r^{b_r} \cdot x_{l+1} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_1 \\
&= a x_{l+1}^{b_{l+1}} \cdots x_i^{b_i} \cdots x_r^{b_r} \cdot x_{l+1} \cdots \widehat{x_i} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_i \\
&= x_1 \cdots \widehat{x_i} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, in the case where $j > r$,

$$\beta(c(dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{dx_i} \wedge \cdots dx_n)) = \beta((-1)^{i-1}(\partial F/\partial X_i)\lambda) = 0 = x_1 \cdots \widehat{x_i} \cdots x_r \cdot \omega_i.$$

Moreover, in this case, $t_{\bar{x}} = x_{l+1} \cdots x_r$. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}/t_{\bar{x}}\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is étale over a ring

$$R = \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - a X_{l+1}^{b_{l+1}} \cdots X_r^{b_r}, X_{l+1} \cdots X_r).$$

Note that if we set $D = \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_{l+1}, \ldots, X_n]/(X_{l+1} \cdots X_r)$, then

$$R \simeq D[X_1, \ldots, X_l]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - a x_{l+1}^{b_{l+1}} \cdots x_r^{b_r}),$$

where $x_{l+1}, \ldots, x_r$ are the classes of $X_{l+1}, \ldots, X_r$ in D. By using Remark 1.1.3, D is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}$ and R is flat over D. Thus, R is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let A be a ring, M an A-module, and N_1 and N_2 A-submodules of M. Let $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism such that B is faithfully flat over A. If $N_1 \otimes_A B = N_2 \otimes_A B$ as B-submodules of $M \otimes_A B$, then $N_1 = N_2$.*

Proof. For each $i = 1, 2$, let us consider a sequence

$$0 \to N_i \to N_1 + N_2 \to 0, \tag{5.3.1}$$

which gives rise to

$$0 \to N_i \otimes_A B \to (N_1 + N_2) \otimes_A B \to 0. \tag{5.3.2}$$

Here, since $N_1 \otimes_A B = N_2 \otimes_A B$, we have $(N_1 + N_2)\otimes_A = N_i \otimes_A B$. Thus, (5.3.2) is exact, which implies that so is (5.3.1). Thus, $N_1 = N_2 = N_1 + N_2$. □

6. Extension of log morphisms

Let S be a locally noetherian scheme and $f : X \to S$ a semistable scheme over S. Let M_X and M_S be fine log structures of X and S respectively. We assume that (X, M_X) are free, integral and log smooth over (S, M_S). Note that, for a point $x \in \operatorname{Sing}(f)$ and $s = f(x)$, $\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ does not split. Thus, it has the unique semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B), where σ is the set of irreducible elements of $\overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ not lying in the image of $\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$, $q_0 \in \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^{\sigma}$. Recall that this q_0 is called the marking of $\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ (cf. Definition 2.2.4). We dente this by $\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S}(x)$. Thus, we have a map

$$\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S} : \operatorname{Sing}(f) \to \coprod_{s \in S} \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}.$$

If we fix $s \in S$, then we get

$$\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S}\big|_{X_{\bar{s}}} \to \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}},$$

where $X_{\bar{s}}$ is the geometric fiber over s. Note that $\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S}\big|_{X_{\bar{s}}}$ is locally constant (cf Proposition 2.2.5). We say $\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S}$ is *regular* if $\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S}(x)$ is regular for every $x \in \operatorname{Sing}(X_{\bar{s}})$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let (A, tA) be a discrete valuation ring and $f : X \to \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ a generically smooth semistable scheme over $S = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$. Let M_S be a fine log structure on S and let M_X and M'_X be fine log structures on X. Let $(f, h) : (X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$ and $(f, h') : (X, M'_X) \to (S, M_S)$ be free, smooth and integral morphisms. If $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S} = \mathcal{B}_{M'_X/M_S}$, $\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S} = \operatorname{mark}_{M'_X/M_S}$ and $\operatorname{mark}_{M_X/M_S}$ is regular, then there is an isomorphism*

$$(\mathrm{id}, h) : (X, M'_X) \xrightarrow{\sim} (X, M_X)$$

over (S, M_S).

Proof. Before starting the proof of Theorem 6.1, we need several preparations. Let (A, m) be a noetherian regular local ring and R the ring of formal power series of n-variables over A, i.e., $R = A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. An element of $f = \sum_I a_I X^I$ of R is said to be primitive if there is no prime element p of A such that $p \mid a_I$ for all I. Then, we have the following:

Lemma 6.2. (1) *For a non-zero $f \in R$, there are $a \in A$ and $f' \in R$ such that $f = af'$ and f' is primitive.*

(2) *If f and g are primitive elements of R, then so is fg.*

(3) *Let a and b be non-zero elements of A, and let f and g be primitive elements of R. If $af = bg$, then there is $u \in A^{\times}$ with $b = ua$.*

(4) *If a is a non-zero element of m, then $X_1 \cdots X_n - a$ is a prime element of R.*

Proof. (1) For $g = \sum_{I \in \mathbb{N}^n} g_I X^I \in R$, the ideal of A generated by $\{g_I\}_{I \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ is denoted by $I(g)$. If $g \neq 0$ and there is a prime element $p \in A$ with $g = pg'$ for some $g' \in R$, then $I(g) = pI(g')$. In particular, $I(g) \subsetneq I(g')$. Thus, we have our assertion because A is noetherian.

(2) We assume that there is a prime element p such that p divides all coefficient of fg. Then, $fg = 0$ in $(A/pA)[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. Thus, either $f = 0$ or $g = 0$ in $(A/pA)[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ because $(A/pA)[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ is an integral domain. This is a contradiction.

(3) It is sufficient to see that if a is divisible by a prime element p, then so is b by p. Indeed, since p divides a, $af = 0$ in $(A/pA)[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. Thus, $bg = 0$ in $(A/pA)[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. We set $g = \sum_I g_I X^I$. Then, since g is primitive, there is I such that $g_I \neq 0$ in A/pA. Then, $bg_I = 0$ in A/pA, which implies that $b = 0$ in A/pA.

(4) We assume that there is a decomposition

$$X_1 \cdots X_n - a = fg$$

with $f, g \notin R^{\times}$. We consider the above decomposition in $(A/m)[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. Then, renumbering $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and replacing f by (unit) $\cdot f$, we may set

$$\bar{f} = X_1 \cdots X_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{g} = X_{i+1} \cdots X_n,$$

where $\bar{f}$ and $\bar{g}$ are the classes of f and g in $(A/m)[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. If $i = n$, then g is a unit. Thus, $i < n$. Here we can find $h, k \in m[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$ with $f = X_1 \cdots X_i + h$ and $g = X_{i+1} \cdots X_n + k$. Therefore,

$$X_1 \cdots X_n - a = (X_1 \cdots X_i + h)(X_{i+1} \cdots X_n + k).$$

Thus,

$$-a = (X_1 \cdots X_i + h(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, 0))k(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, 0).$$

Here, by (1), there is $b \in A$ and $k' \in A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]\!]$ such that

$$k(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, 0) = bk'$$

and k' is primitive. Thus, by (2) and (3), we have $u \in A^{\times}$ with $b = -au$. Hence,

$$1 = (X_1 \cdots X_i + h(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}, 0))k'u.$$

Therefore, $1 = h(0, \ldots, 0)k'(0, \ldots, 0)u$, which means that $h(0, \ldots, 0) \in A^{\times}$. This is a contradiction because $h \in m[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. □

Next, we consider primary decompositions in the special rings.

Proposition 6.3. *Let (A, tA) be a discrete valuation ring and*

$$R = A[\![X_1, \ldots, X_l, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]\!]/(X^{\Delta} - ut^a Y^B),$$

where u is a unit, a is a positive integer, $\Delta = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^l$ and $B \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Let I be an element of $\mathbb{N}^n$ such that $I(j) \leq B(j)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. We denote the class of X_i and the class of Y_j in R by x_i and y_j respectively. Then, we have the following:

(1) *R is an integral domain.*

(2) *The ideals* (x_i, t) $(1 \leq i \leq l)$ *and* (x_i, y_j) $(1 \leq i \leq l,\ j \in \operatorname{Supp}(B))$ *of* R *are distinct prime ideals such that* $\dim R/(x_i, t) = \dim R/(x_i, y_j) = l + n - 1$ *for all* $i = 1, \dots, l$ *and all* $j \in \operatorname{Supp}(B)$.

(3) $(t^a y^I) = (x_1, t^a y^I) \cap \cdots \cap (x_l, t^a y^I)$.

(4) *For each* $i = 1, \dots, l$,
$$(x_i, t^a y^I) = (x_i, t^a) \cap \bigcap_{j \in \operatorname{Supp}(I)} (x_i, y_j^{I(j)})$$
is a primary decomposition with no embedded primes. Moreover, $\sqrt{(x_i, t^a)} = (x_i, t)$ *and* $\sqrt{(x_i, y_j^{I(j)})} = (x_i, y_j)$.

(5) *Let* $j_1, \dots, j_r$ *be distinct elements of* $\{1, \dots, n\}$. *Then,*
$$(y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_r}) = (y_{j_1}) \cap \cdots \cap (y_{j_r}).$$

(6) *If* $j \notin \operatorname{Supp}(B)$, *then* y_j *is a prime element of* R. *Moreover, if* $j \in \operatorname{Supp}(B)$, *then* $(y_j) = (x_1, y_j) \cap \cdots \cap (x_l, y_j)$ *is a primary decomposition with no embedded primes.*

Proof. (1) This is a consequence of Lemma 6.2.

(2) It is easy to see these facts by the following canonical isomorphisms:
$$R/(x_i, t) \simeq (A/tA)[\![X_1, \dots, \widehat{X_i}, \dots, X_l, Y]\!].$$
$$R/(x_i, y_j) \simeq A[\![X_1, \dots, \widehat{X_i}, \dots, X_l, Y_1, \dots, \widehat{Y_j}, \dots, Y_n]\!] \qquad (j \in \operatorname{Supp}(B)).$$

(3) Let us begin with the following claim:

Claim 6.3.1. *Let* f *be an element of* $A[\![X, Y]\!]$, *and let* $I \in \mathbb{N}^n$. *If*
$$f|_{X_i=0} = f(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, 0, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_l, Y)$$
is divisible by $t^a Y^I$ *for every* $i = 1, \dots, l$, *then there are* $g, h \in A[\![X, Y]\!]$ *with* $f = t^a Y^I g + X^\Delta h$.

We set
$$f = f_1 + X_1 f_2 + X_1 X_2 f_3 + \cdots + X_1 \cdots X_{l-1} f_l + X_1 \cdots X_l h,$$
where $h \in A[\![X, Y]\!]$ and $f_i \in A[\![X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_l, Y]\!]$. Here we see $t^a Y^I \mid f_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, l$ by induction on i. In the case where $i = 1$, $f_1 = f(0, X_2, \dots, X_l, Y)$. Thus, $t^a Y^I \mid f_1$. In general,
$$f|_{X_i=0} = f_1|_{X_i=0} + X_1\ f_2|_{X_i=0} + \cdots + X_1 \cdots X_{i-1} f_i.$$
Thus, using hypothesis of induction, we can see that $t^a Y^I \mid f_i$. Therefore, we get the claim.

Clearly, $(t^a y^I) \subseteq (x_1, t^a y^I) \cap \cdots \cap (x_l, t^a y^I)$. We assume
$$\bar{f} \in (x_1, t^a y^I) \cap \cdots \cap (x_l, t^a y^I),$$
where $f \in A[\![X, Y]\!]$. Since $\bar{f} \in (x_i, t^a y^I)$, there are $v, w, z \in A[\![X_1, \dots, X_n]\!]$ with $f = X_i v + t^a Y^I w + (X^\Delta - u t^a Y^B) z$. Thus,
$$f|_{X_i=0} = \left(w|_{X_i=0} - (uz)|_{X_i=0}\, Y^{B-I} \right) t^a Y^I.$$
Thus, by the above claim, there are $g, h \in A[\![X_1, \dots, X_n]\!]$ with $f = t^a Y^I g + X^\Delta h$. Therefore, $\bar{f} \in (t^a y^I)$.

(4) The decomposition

$$(x_i, t^a y^I) = (x_i, t^a) \cap \bigcap_{j \in \operatorname{Supp}(I)} (x_i, y_j^{I(j)})$$

is obvious because

$$R/(x_i, t^a y^I) \simeq A[\![X_1, \ldots, \widehat{X_i}, \ldots, X_n, Y]\!]/(t^a Y^I).$$

We need to show that (x_i, t^a) and $(x_i, y_j^{I(j)})$ are primary ideals and $\sqrt{(x_i, t^a)} = (x_i, t)$ and $\sqrt{(x_i, y_j^{I(j)})} = (x_i, y_j)$. Let us see the following claim:

Claim 6.3.2. *Let C be a noetherian ring. If C satisfies the property:*

$$xy = 0 \text{ and } y \notin \sqrt{0} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad x = 0,$$

then $C[\![T]\!]$ holds the same property and $\sqrt{0_{C[\![T]\!]}} = \sqrt{0_C}[\![T]\!]$.

Since C is noetherian, there is a positive integer N such that $\sqrt{0_C}^N = 0$. Thus, it is easy to see that $\sqrt{0_{C[\![T]\!]}} = \sqrt{0_C}[\![T]\!]$. We assume that $fg = 0$ and $g \notin \sqrt{0_{C[\![T]\!]}}$. We set $g = \sum_i g_i T^i$. If $a_i \in \sqrt{0_C}$ for all i, then $g \in \sqrt{0_{C[\![T]\!]}}$. Thus, there is i such that $g_i \notin \sqrt{0_C}$ and $g_0, \ldots, g_{i-1} \in \sqrt{0_C}$. Here we set $g_1 = g_0 + \cdots + g_{i-1}T^{i-1}$. Then $g = g_1 + T^i g_2$ and $g_2(0) \notin \sqrt{0_C}$. Note that

$$f(g - g_1)^N = \sum_{j=0}^{N} (-1)^{N-i} \binom{N}{i} f g^i g_1^{N-i} = (-1)^N f g_1^N = 0.$$

Hence, $fg_2^N = 0$. By this observation, we may assume that $g_0 \notin \sqrt{0_C}$. We set $f = \sum_i f_i T^i$. Then, $fg = f_0 g_0 + \cdots = 0$. Thus, $f_0 = 0$. Hence $fg = f_1 g_0 T + \cdots = 0$. Therefore, $f_1 = 0$. In the same way, we can see $f_i = 0$ for all i.

First of all,

$$R/(x_i, t^a) = (A/t^a A)[\![X_1, \ldots, \widehat{X_i}, \ldots, X_l, Y]\!].$$

Thus, by the previous claim, (x_i, t^a) is a primary ideal and

$$\sqrt{0_{R/(x_i, t^a)}} = (tA/t^a A)[\![X_1, \ldots, \widehat{X_i}, \ldots, X_l, Y]\!],$$

i.e., $\sqrt{(x_i, t^a)} = (x_i, t)$. Moreover, if $I(j) \neq 0$, then

$$R/(x_i, y_j^{I(j)}) = A[\![X_1, \ldots, \widehat{X_i}, \ldots, X_l, Y]\!]/(Y_j^{I(j)}).$$

Therefore, $(x_i, y_j^{I(j)})$ is a primary and $\sqrt{(x_i, y_j^{I(j)})} = (x_i, y_j)$.

(5) First, we assume that A is complete. Let $\pi : A[\![X, Y]\!] \to R$ be the canonical homomorphism. Here we consider $\Gamma = \{C \in \mathbb{N}^l \mid \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) \not\subseteq \operatorname{Supp}(C)\}$. Then, by Lemma 1.1.2, the map

$$\left\{ \sum_{C \in \Gamma, D \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_{C,D} X^C Y^D \mid a_{C,D} \in A \right\} \xrightarrow{\pi} R$$

is bijective. In order to see out assertion, it is sufficient to see that if y_{j_a} divides $y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_{a-1}} f$, then y_{j_a} divides f. We set $f = \sum_{C \in \Gamma, D \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_{C,D} x^C y^D$ and $y_{j_1} \cdots y_{j_{a-1}} f = y_{j_a} \sum_{C \in \Gamma, D \in \mathbb{N}^n} b_{C,D} x^C y^D$. Then,

$$\sum_{C \in \Gamma, D \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_{C,D} x^C y^{D + e_{j_1} + \cdots + e_{j_{a-1}}} = \sum_{C \in \Gamma, D \in \mathbb{N}^n} b_{C,D} x^C y^{D + e_{j_a}}.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{C\in\Gamma, D\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_{C,D}X^CY^{D+e_{j_1}+\cdots+e_{j_{a-1}}} = \sum_{C\in\Gamma, D\in\mathbb{N}^n} b_{C,D}X^CY^{D+e_{j_a}}$$

in $A[\![X,Y]\!]$. Therefore, if $D(j_a)=0$, then $a_{C,D}=0$. Hence,

$$f = \sum_{C\in\Gamma, D\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_{C,D+e_{j_a}}x^Cy^{D+e_{j_a}} = y_{j_a}\sum_{C\in\Gamma, D\in\mathbb{N}^n} a_{C,D+e_{j_a}}x^Cy^D.$$

Thus, we get (5) in the case where A is complete.

In general, let $\widehat{A}$ be the completion of A. We set

$$R' = \widehat{A}[\![X_1,\ldots,X_l,Y_1,\ldots,Y_n]\!]/(X^\Delta - ut^aY^B),$$

Then, R' is faithfully flat over R'. By the previous observation,

$$y_{j_1}\cdots y_{j_r}R' = y_{j_1}R'\cap\cdots\cap y_{j_r}R'.$$

Therefore, using the faithfully flatness of R' over R,

$$\begin{aligned} y_{j_1}\cdots y_{j_r}R &= (y_{j_1}\cdots y_{j_r}R')\cap R = (y_{j_1}R'\cap\cdots\cap y_{j_r}R')\cap R \\ &= ((y_{j_1}R')\cap R)\cap\cdots\cap((y_{j_r}R')\cap R) = y_{j_1}R\cap\cdots\cap y_{j_r}R. \end{aligned}$$

(6) We assume that $j\not\in\operatorname{Supp}(B)$. Since

$$R/(y_j)\simeq A[\![X,Y_1,\ldots,\widehat{Y_j},\ldots,Y_n]\!]/(X^\Delta - (u|_{X_j=0})t^aY^B),$$

this is an integral domain by (1).

Next we assume that $j\in\operatorname{Supp}(B)$. Then

$$R/(y_j)\simeq A[\![X,Y_1,\ldots,\widehat{Y_j},\ldots,Y_n]\!]/(X^\Delta).$$

Thus, we get our assertion. □

Finally, we consider the following proposition.

Proposition 6.4. *Let (A,tA) be a discrete valuation ring and R an A-algebra. We assume that we have two isomorphisms*

$$\phi : C = A[\![X_1,\ldots,X_l,Y_1,\ldots,Y_n]\!]/(X^\Delta - ut^aY^B) \xrightarrow{\sim} R$$

and

$$\phi' : C' = A[\![X'_1,\ldots,X'_l,Y'_1,\ldots,Y'_n]\!]/({X'}^\Delta - u't^a{Y'}^{B'}) \xrightarrow{\sim} R$$

over A, where $l\geq 2$, u and u' are units, a is a positive integer, $\Delta=(1,\ldots,1)\in\mathbb{N}^l$ and $B,B'\in\mathbb{N}^n$. We denote the class of X_i and the class of Y_j in C by x_i and y_j respectively, and the class of X'_i and the class of Y'_j in C' by x'_i and y'_j respectively. We assume that there are subsets Γ and Γ' of $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ such that $\operatorname{Supp}(B)\subseteq\Gamma$, $\operatorname{Supp}(B')\subseteq\Gamma'$ *and that $\prod_{j\in\Gamma'}\phi'(y'_j) = v\prod_{j\in\Gamma}\phi(y_j)$ for some $v\in R^\times$. Then, after renumbering $X_1,\ldots,X_l$, $Y_1,\ldots,Y_n$, $X'_1,\ldots,X'_l$ and $Y'_1,\ldots,Y'_n$, we have $\Gamma=\Gamma'$, $B=B'$ and there are families $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^l$ and $\{v_j\}_{j\in\Gamma}$ of $R^\times$ such that $\phi'(x'_i)=u_i\phi(x_i)$ for all $i=1,\ldots,l$ and $\phi'(y'_j)=v_j\phi(y_j)$ for all $j\in\Gamma$.*

Proof. By abuse of notation, $\phi(x_i)$, $\phi(y_j)$, $\phi'(x'_i)$ and $\phi'(y'_j)$ are denoted by x_i, y_j, x'_i and y'_j respectively. First, we claim the following:

Claim 6.4.1. *Renumbering $X_1,\ldots,X_l$ and $X'_1,\ldots,X'_l$, there are $z_1,\ldots,z_l\in R^\times$ and $w_1,\ldots,w_l$ such that $x'_i = z_ix_i + t^aw_i$ for all $i=1,\ldots,l$.*

By (3) and (4) of Proposition 6.3 for $I = 0$,

$$(t^a) = (x_1, t^a) \cap \cdots \cap (x_l, t^a) = (x'_1, t^a) \cap \cdots \cap (x'_l, t^a)$$

are primary decompositions with no embedded primes. Thus, renumbering $X_1, \ldots, X_l$ and $X'_1, \ldots, X'_l$, we have $(x_i, t^a) = (x'_i, t^a)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Therefore, there are $z_i, w_i, z'_i, w'_i \in R$ with

$$\begin{cases} x_i = x'_i z'_i + t^a w'_i \\ x'_i = x_i z_i + t^a w_i \end{cases}$$

Thus, $x_i = z_i z'_i x_i + t^a(w_i z'_i + w'_i)$, which implies that $(1 - z_i z'_i)x_i \equiv 0 \mod tR$. If $z_i z'_i \in (t, x_1, \ldots, x_l, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$, then $(1 - z_i z'_i) \in R^{\times}$. Thus, $x_i \equiv 0 \mod tR$. This is a contradiction because $l \geq 2$. Therefore, $z_i z'_i \in R^{\times}$, i.e., $z_i, z'_i \in R^{\times}$.

By using (5) and (6) of Proposition 6.3, if we set $I = (y_1 \cdots y_r) = (y'_1 \cdots y'_{r'})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \bigcap_{j \in \Gamma \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(B)} (y_j) \cap \bigcap_{j \in \mathrm{Supp}(B)} (x_1, y_j) \cap \cdots \cap (x_l, y_j) \\ &= \bigcap_{j \in \Gamma \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(B')} (y'_j) \cap \bigcap_{j \in \mathrm{Supp}(B')} (x'_1, y'_j) \cap \cdots \cap (x'_l, y'_j) \end{aligned}$$

are primary decompositions with no embedded primes. Here we claim the following;

Claim 6.4.2. (i) *$(y_j) \neq (x'_{i'}, y'_{j'})$ for $j \in \Gamma$, $i' \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$ and $j' \in \Gamma'$. Moreover, $(y'_{j'}) \neq (x_i, y_j)$ for $j' \in \Gamma'$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$ and $j \in \Gamma$.*
(ii) *If $(x_i, y_j) = (x'_{i'}, y'_{j'})$, then $i = i'$, where $i, i' \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$, $j \in \Gamma$ and $j' \in \Gamma'$.*
(iii) *If $(x_1, y_j) = (x'_1, y'_{j'})$ for some $j \in \Gamma$ and $j' \in \Gamma'$, then $(x_i, y_j) = (x'_i, y_{j'})$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, l$.*

(i) We assume that $(y_j) = (x'_{i'}, y'_{j'})$. Note that $x'_{i'} = 0$ in $R/(t, x'_{i'}, y'_{j'})$. Since $x'_{i'} = z_{i'} x_{i'} + t w_{i'}$, $x_{i'} = 0$ in $R/(t, x'_{i'}, y'_{j'})$. On the other hand, $x_{i'} \neq 0$ in $R/(t, y_j)$. This is a contradiction.

(ii) $x_i = 0$ in $R/(t, x_i, y_j)$. Thus, in the same way as (i), $x'_i = 0$ in $R/(t, x_i, y_j)$. On the other hand, if $i \neq i'$, then $x'_i \neq 0$ in $R/(t, x'_{i'}, y'_{j'})$. Thus, $i = i'$.

(iii) By using (i), (ii) and the above primary decompositions, we can see $(x_i, y_j) = (x'_i, y'_{j''})$ for some $1 \leq j'' \leq r'$. Thus, $(t, x_1, \ldots, x_l, y_j) = (t, x'_1, \ldots, x'_l, y'_{j''})$. On the other hand, since $(x_1, y_j) = (x'_1, y'_{j'})$, we have $(t, x_1, \ldots, x_l, y_j) = (t, x'_1, \ldots, x'_l, y'_{j'})$. Therefore, $j' = j''$.

By the above claim, renumbering $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ and $Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_n$, we have $\Gamma = \Gamma'$. Moreover, $(y_j) = (y'_j)$ if $j \notin \mathrm{Supp}(B)$ and $(x_1, y_j) = (x'_1, y'_j), \ldots, (x_l, y_j) = (x'_l, y'_j)$ if $j \in \mathrm{Supp}(B)$. In particular, $(y_j) = (y'_j)$ for all $j \in \Gamma$, namely, there is $v_j \in R^{\times}$ with $y'_j = v_j y_j$.

Here, using Claim 6.4.1,

$$\begin{aligned} t^a\phi'(u'){y'}^{B'} &= x'_1\cdots x'_l \\ &= (z_1x_1+t^aw_1)\cdots(z_lx_l+t^aw_l) \\ &= z_1\cdots z_lx_1\cdots x_l + t^a\sum_i w_iz_1\cdots\widehat{z_i}\cdots z_lx_1\cdots\widehat{x_i}\cdots x_l + t^{2a}h \\ &= t^az_1\cdots z_l\phi(u)y^B + t^a\sum_i w_iz_1\cdots\widehat{z_i}\cdots z_lx_1\cdots\widehat{x_i}\cdots x_l + t^{2a}h \end{aligned}$$

for some $h\in R$. Therefore, we get

$$\phi'(u'){y'}^{B'} = z_1\cdots z_l\phi(u)y^B + \sum_i w_iz_1\cdots\widehat{z_i}\cdots z_lx_1\cdots\widehat{x_i}\cdots x_l + t^ah.$$

Hence, since $y'_j = v_jy_j$ for $j\in\Gamma$,

$$\phi'(u')\left(\prod_{j\in\Gamma} v_j^{B'(j)}\right)y^{B'} \equiv z_1\cdots z_l\phi(u)y^B \qquad \bmod (t, x_1,\dots,x_l).$$

Note that $(A/tA)\llbracket Y\rrbracket \xrightarrow{\sim} R/(t,x_1,\dots,x_l)$. Thus, $B=B'$. Therefore, if we set $J=(t^ay^B)=(t^a{y'}^{B'})$, then, by using (3) and (4) of Proposition 6.3 for $I=B$, we have two primary decompositions of J:

$$J=\bigcap_{i=1}^{l}\left((x_i,t^a)\cap\bigcap_{j\in\mathrm{Supp}(B)}(x_i,y_j^{B(j)})\right)=\bigcap_{i=1}^{l}\left((x'_i,t^a)\cap\bigcap_{j\in\mathrm{Supp}(B)}(x'_i,{y'}_j^{B(j)})\right).$$

First of all, $(x_i,t^a)=(x'_i,t^a)$ for all $i=1,\dots,l$. Moreover, if $(x_i,y_j)=(x'_{i'},y'_{j'})$ for $i,i'\in\{1,\dots,l\}$ and $j,j'\in\Gamma$, then $i=i'$ and $j=j'$ because

$$\begin{cases} x'_i\equiv z_ix_i \mod tR \text{ for } i=1,\dots,l, \\ y'_j=v_jy_j \text{ for } j=1,\dots,r, \\ (A/tA)\llbracket X_1,\dots,\widehat{X_i},\dots,X_l,Y_1,\dots,\widehat{Y_j},\dots,Y_n\rrbracket\simeq R/(t,x_i,y_j), \\ (A/tA)\llbracket X'_1,\dots,\widehat{X'_{i'}},\dots,X'_l,Y'_1,\dots,\widehat{Y'_{j'}},\dots,Y'_n\rrbracket\simeq R/(t,x'_{i'},y'_{j'}). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, by using the uniqueness of primary decomposition, $(x_i,y_j^{B(j)})=(x'_i,{y'}_j^{B(j)})$ for $1\le i\le l$ and $j\in\mathrm{Supp}(B)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (x_i)=(x_i,t^ay^B) &= (x_i,t^a)\cap\bigcap_{j\in\mathrm{Supp}(B)}(x_i,y_j^{B(j)}) \\ &= (x'_i,t^a)\cap\bigcap_{j\in\mathrm{Supp}(B)}(x'_i,{y'}_j^{B(j)}) = (x'_i,t^a{y'}^B)=(x'_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there is $u_i\in R^\times$ with $x'_i=u_ix_i$ for $i=1,\dots,l$. □

Let us start the proof of Theorem 6.1. First, we claim the following:

Claim 6.4.3. *We may assume that A/tA is algebraically closed and there is a fine and sharp monoid Q together with a homomorphism $\pi_Q: Q\to M_{S,s}$ such that the induced homomorphism $Q\to M_{S,\bar{s}}\to\overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is bijective.*

Let us denote the special point of $S = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ by s. By Proposition 2.3.1, there are a local homomorphism $f : (A, tA) \to (A', n)$ of noetherian local rings and a fine and sharp monoid Q together with a homomorphism $\pi_Q : Q \to M_{\mathrm{Spec}(A'),n} = M_{S,s} \boxplus_{A^\times} {A'}^\times$ such that f is flat and quasi-finite and that the induced homomorphism $Q \to \overline{M}_{\mathrm{Spec}(A'),\overline{n}}$ is bijective. Let P be a minimal prime of A' such that $\mathrm{Spec}(A'/P) \to \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ is surjective. Moreover, let A_1 be the localization of the normalization of A'/P at a closed point. Then, A_1 is a discrete valuation ring by [8, Theorem 11.7]. Let t_1 be the uniformizing parameter of A_1. Moreover, [8, Theorem 29.1], there is a ring extension A_2 of A_1 such that $(A_2, t_1 A_2)$ is a discrete valuation ring and A_2/t_1A_2 is algebraically closed. Therefore, by (2) of Theorem 4.5, we get our claim.

Let x be a closed point of X. By the rigidity theorem, it is sufficient to construct a homomorphism in a Zariski neighborhood of x. By the above claim, there are fine and sharp monoids P and P' together with homomorphisms $\pi_P : P \to M_{X,\bar{x}}$, $\pi_{P'} : P' \to M'_{X,\bar{x}}$, $f : Q \to P$ and $f' : Q \to P'$ with the following properties:

1. The induced homomorphisms $P \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $P' \to \overline{M}'_{X,\bar{x}}$ are bijective.
2. The diagrams
$$\begin{tikzcd} Q \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, "\pi_Q"'] & P \arrow[d, "\pi_P"] & Q \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "\pi_Q"'] & P' \arrow[d, "\pi_{P'}"] \\ M_{S,\bar{s}} \arrow[r] & M_{X,\bar{x}} & M_{S,\bar{s}} \arrow[r] & M'_{X,\bar{x}} \end{tikzcd}$$
are commutative.
3. $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P] \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P'] \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ are smooth.

First we assume f is smooth at x. Then, $P = f(Q) \times \mathbb{N}^r$ and $P' = f'(Q) \times \mathbb{N}^{r'}$ for some non-negative integers r and r'. Let $Y_1, \ldots, Y_r$ and $Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_{r'}$ be all irreducible elements of $\mathbb{N}^r$ and $\mathbb{N}^{r'}$ respectively. Since $\mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is smooth over $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P]$ and $A \otimes_{A[Q]} A[P']$, adding indeterminates $Y_{r+1}, \ldots, Y_n$ and $Y'_{r'+1}, \ldots, Y'_n$, we have two isomorphisms

$$\phi : \widehat{A}[\![Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]\!] \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\bar{x}} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi' : \widehat{A}[\![Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_n]\!] \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,\bar{x}}.$$

Then, $\phi'(Y'_1) \cdots \phi'(Y'_{r'}) = v\phi(Y_1) \cdots \phi(Y_r)$ for some $v \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\times_{X,\bar{x}}$ because $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S} = \mathcal{B}_{M'_X/M_S}$. Thus, renumbering $Y_1, \ldots, Y_r$ and $Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_{r'}$, we have $r = r'$ and there are $v_1, \ldots, v_r \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\times_{X,\bar{x}}$ with $\phi'(Y'_i) = v_i\phi(Y_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Note that by Artin's approximation theorem [1], we may assume that $v_1, \ldots, v_l \in \mathcal{O}^\times_{X,\bar{x}}$. Here, we define

$$H : P \times \mathcal{O}^\times_{X,\bar{x}} \to P' \times \mathcal{O}^\times_{X,\bar{x}}$$

to be

$$H((f(q), Y^I), u) = ((f'(q), {Y'}^I), v^I u).$$

Thus, we get a homomorphism $h : M_{X,\bar{x}} \to M'_{X,\bar{x}}$ such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd} P \times \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}} \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[d, "H"'] & M_{X,\bar{x}} \arrow[d, "h"] \\ P' \times \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}} \arrow[r, "\sim"] & M'_{X,\bar{x}}. \end{tikzcd}$$

Therefore, by (1) of Theorem 4.5, $h : M_{X,\bar{x}} \to M'_{X,\bar{x}}$ descends to a homomorphism $M_X \to M'_X$ around a Zariski neighborhood of x

Next we assume that f is not smooth at x. Note that $Q \to P$ and $Q \to P'$ have semistable structures (σ, q_0, Δ, B) and $(\sigma', q'_0, \Delta', B')$. Clearly, by our assumption, $q_0 = q'_0$. Moreover, we have $l = \#\operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) = \#\operatorname{Supp}(\Delta') \geq 2$ because l is the multiplicity of the special fiber at x. We set

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) = \{X_1, \ldots, X_l\}, \\ \sigma \setminus \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta) = \{Y_1, \ldots, Y_r\}, \\ \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta') = \{X'_1, \ldots, X'_l\}, \\ \sigma' \setminus \operatorname{Supp}(\Delta') = \{Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_{r'}\} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we set $\beta(q_0) = t^a u$, where $\beta : M_{S,\bar{s}} \to A^h$ is the canonical homomorphism, u is a unit of A^h and a is a positive integer. Then,

$$A^h \otimes_{A^h[Q]} A^h[P] = A^h[X, Y]/(X^{\Delta} - ut^a Y^B)$$

and

$$A^h \otimes_{A[{}^hQ]} A^h[P'] = A^h[X', Y']/({X'}^{\Delta} - ut^a {Y'}^{B'}).$$

Therefore, adding indeterminates $Y_{r+1}, \ldots, Y_n$ and $Y'_{r'+1}, \ldots, Y'_n$, we have two isomorphisms

$$\phi : C = \widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_l, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]\!]/(X^{\Delta} - ut^a Y^B) \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$$

and

$$\phi' : C' = \widehat{A}[\![X'_1, \ldots, X'_l, Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_n]\!]/({X'}^{\Delta} - u't^a {Y'}^{B'}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$$

over $\widehat{A}$. We denote the class of X_i and the class of Y_j in C by x_i and y_j respectively, and the class of X'_i and the class of Y'_j in C' by x'_i and y'_j respectively. Since $\mathcal{B}_{M_X/M_S} = \mathcal{B}_{M'_X/M_S}$, we can see that $\phi'(y'_1) \cdots \phi'(y'_{r'}) = v\phi(y_1) \cdots \phi(y_r)$ for some $v \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}^{\times}$. Thus, by Proposition 6.4, after renumbering $X_1, \ldots, X_l$, $Y_1, \ldots, Y_r$, $X'_1, \ldots, X'_l$ and $Y'_1, \ldots, Y'_{r'}$, we have $r = r'$, $B = B'$ and there are families $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^l$ and $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^r$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}^{\times}$ such that $\phi'(x'_i) = u_i \phi(x_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, l$ and $\phi'(y'_j) = v_j \phi(y_j)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, r$. Note that

$$\phi(x_1), \ldots, \phi(x_l), \phi(y_1), \ldots, \phi(y_r), \phi'(x'_1), \ldots, \phi'(x'_l), \phi'(y'_1), \ldots, \phi'(y'_r) \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$$

Thus, using Artin's approximation theorem [1], we may assume that

$$u_1, \ldots, u_l, v_1, \ldots, v_r \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{B(1)} \cdots v_r^{B(r)} ut^a \phi(y)^B &= ut^a \phi'(y')^{B'} = \phi'(x'_1) \cdots \phi'(x'_l) \\ &= u_1 \cdots u_l \phi(x_1) \cdots \phi(x_l) = u_1 \cdots u_l ut^a \phi(y)^B. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $u_1 \cdots u_l = v_1^{B(1)} \cdots v_r^{B(r)}$ because $ut^a \phi(y)^B$ is a regular element. Hence, we can define

$$H : P \times \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times} \to P' \times \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}$$

to be

$$\begin{cases} H(X_i, 1) = (X'_i, u_i) & i = 1, \ldots, l, \\ H(Y_j, 1) = (Y'_j, v_j) & j = 1, \ldots, r, \\ H(f(q), 1) = (f'(q), 1) & q \in Q, \\ H(1, u) = (1, u) & u \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}^{\times}. \end{cases}$$

We need to see that this is well-defined. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} H(X_1 \cdots X_l, 1) &= (X'_1 \cdots X'_l, u_1 \cdots u_l) \\ &= (f'(q_0) \cdot {Y'}_1^{B(1)} \cdots {Y'}_r^{B(r)}, v_1^{B(1)} \cdots v_r^{B(r)}) \\ &= H(f(q_0) \cdot Y_1^{B(1)} \cdots Y_r^{B(r)}, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get a homomorphism $h : M_{X,\bar{x}} \to M'_{X,\bar{x}}$ such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd} P \times \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}} \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[d, "H"'] & M_{X,\bar{x}} \arrow[d, "h"] \\ P' \times \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}} \arrow[r, "\sim"] & M'_{X,\bar{x}}. \end{tikzcd}$$

This descends to a homomorphism $M_X \to M'_X$ around a Zariski neighborhood of x by (1) of Theorem 4.5. □

7. Semistable schemes of log canonical type

7.1. **Moderate semistable schemes.** Let $f : X \to S$ be a semistable scheme over a locally noetherian scheme S. For $x \in X$ and $s = f(x)$, we say f is *moderate at* x if there are a smooth $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$-algebra B and $X_1, \ldots, X_n, G \in B$ with the following properties:

(1) $dX_1, \ldots, dX_n$ form a free basis of $\Omega_{B/\mathcal{O}_{S,s}}$ and $G \in m_{S,s}B$.
(2) There is an étale neighborhood (U, x') of X at x together with an étale morphism $\rho : U \to \operatorname{Spec}(B/(X_1 \cdots X_l - G))$.
(3) $dG \in BdX_{l+1} + \cdots + BdX_n$.

Note that if f is smooth at x, then f is moderate at x.

First, let us see the following proposition.

Proposition 7.1.1. *Let (A, m_A) be a noetherian ring such that A/m_A is algebraically closed. Let $X \to \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ be a semistable scheme over A.*

(1) *We assume that (A, m_A) is a discrete valuation ring with a uniformizing parameter t. For a closed point $x \in X$, if $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is regular, then f is moderate at x.*
(2) *If (A, m_A) is complete and $\dim f = 1$, then f is moderate at any closed point of X.*

Proof. (1) By Proposition 1.2.2, there is a surjective homomorphism

$$\phi : \widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!] \to \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$$

with $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi) = (X_1 \cdots X_l - G)$ for some $G \in t\widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. Here we set $I = (X_1 \cdots X_l - G)$, $M = (t, X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ and $G = \sum_{J \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_J X^J$. We assume $a_{(0,\ldots,0)} \in$

$t^2\widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]$. Then, since $G - a_{(0,\ldots,0)} \in M^2$, $G \in M^2$. Thus, $I \subseteq M^2$. Therefore,

$$m_{X,x}/m_{X,x}^2 \simeq M/(I + M^2) = M/M^2.$$

This contradicts to the assumption that $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is regular. Hence

$$a_{(0,\ldots,0)} \in t\widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!] \setminus t^2\widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!].$$

Thus, there is $u \in \widehat{A}[\![X_1, \ldots, X_n]\!]^{\times}$ with $G = t \cdot u$. Therefore, replacing X_1 by $u^{-1}X_1$, we may take G as t. Hence, by Proposition 1.1.4, f is moderate at x.

(2) By Proposition 1.2.2, there is a surjective homomorphism

$$\phi : A[\![X_1, X_2]\!] \to \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$$

with $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi) = (X_1X_2 - G)$ for some $G \in m_A[\![X_1, X_n]\!]$. We denote $\phi(X_1)$, $\phi(X_2)$ and $\phi(G)$ by x_1, x_2 and g. Here we claim the following:

Claim 7.1.1.1. *There are sequences $\{h_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, $\{h'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with the following properties:*

- (a) $h_n, h'_n \in m_A^n\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$ *for all* $n \geq 1$.
- (b) $a_n \in m_A^n$ *for all* $n \geq 1$.
- (c) $(x_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i)(x_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} h'_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \in m_A^{n+1}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$ *for all* $n \geq 1$.

First g can be written as a form $g = a_1 - x_1h'_1 - x_2h_1$ with $a_1 \in m_A$ and $h_1, h'_1 \in m_A\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$. Then,

$$(x_1 + h_1)(x_2 + h'_1) - a_1 = h_1h'_1 \in m_A^2\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}.$$

We assume that $\{h_1, \ldots, h_n\}$, $\{h'_1, \ldots, h'_n\}$ and $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ have been constructed. Then, we set

$$\left(x_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i\right)\left(x_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} h'_i\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i = a_{n+1} - x_1h'_{n+1} - x_2h_{n+1},$$

where $h_{n+1}, h'_{n+1} \in m_A^{n+1}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$ and $a_{n+1} \in m_A^{n+1}$. Then

$$\left(x_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} h_i\right)\left(x_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} h'_i\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_i = \\ h'_{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i + h_{n+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} h'_i + h_{n+1}h'_{n+1} \in m_A^{n+2}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}.$$

Thus, we get the claim.

Here we set $h = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i$ and $h' = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h'_i$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x}$, and $a = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i$ in A. Then

$$\begin{cases} a = (x_1 + h)(x_2 + h') \\ h, h' \in m_A\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,x} \text{ and } a \in m_A. \end{cases}$$

Let us take $H, H' \in m_A[\![X_1, X_2]\!]$ such that $\phi(H) = h$ and $\phi(H') = h'$. Then,

$$\phi((X_1 + H)(X_2 + H') - a) = 0.$$

Hence, by Lemma 1.1.2 and Lemma 1.1.6, we can see that

$$\operatorname{Ker}(\phi) = ((X_1 + H)(X_2 + H') - a).$$

Therefore, replacing X_1 by $X_1 + H$ and X_2 by $X_2 + H'$, we may assume $G \in m_A$. Thus, by Proposition 1.1.4, f is moderate at x. $\square$

Remark 7.1.2. Let $f : X \to S$ be a semistable scheme over a locally noetherian scheme S. Let M_X and M_S be fine log structures on X and S respectively. We assume that $f : X \to S$ extends to an integral and log smooth morphism $(f, h) : (X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$. Let $x \in X$ and $s = f(x)$. If there are a fine and sharp monoid Q and a homomorphism $\pi_Q :\to M_{S,\bar{s}}$ such that $Q \to M_{S,\bar{s}} \to \overline{M}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is bijective, then f is moderate at x.

Indeed, there is a fine and sharp monoid P together with homomorphisms $\pi_P : P \to M_{X,\bar{x}}$ and $Q \to P$ such that $P \to M_{X,\bar{x}} \to \overline{M}_{X,\bar{x}}$ is bijective and the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
Q \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi_Q"'] & P \arrow[d, "\pi_P"] \\
M_{S,\bar{s}} \arrow[r, "h_{\bar{x}}"] & M_{X,\bar{x}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Then,

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] \to \mathcal{O}_{X,\bar{x}}$$

is smooth. If f is smooth at x, then the assertion is obvious, so that we assume that f is not smooth at x.

In the case where $Q \to P$ splits, $P \simeq Q \times N$ and N is isomorphic to the monoid arising from the monomials of $\mathbb{Z}[U, V]/(U^2 - V^2)$ by the local structure theorem (cf. Theorem 2.4.1). Thus,

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[U, V]/(U^2 - V^2) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, X_2]/(X_1 X_2)$$

because 2 is invertible in $\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}$. This means that f is moderate at x.

In the case where $Q \to P$ does not split, P has a semistable structure (σ, q_0, Δ, B) over Q by the local structure theorem. Here σ is the set of all irreducible elements of P not coming from Q, $q_0 \in Q$, and $\Delta, B \in \mathbb{N}^\sigma$. We set $\sigma = \{X_1, \ldots, X_l, Y_1, \ldots, Y_r\}$ such that $\mathrm{Supp}(\Delta) = \{X_1, \ldots, X_l\}$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(B) \subseteq \{Y_1, \ldots, Y_r\}$. Moreover, we set $b_j = B(Y_j)$ for all j and $t = \alpha(\pi_Q(q_0))$, where $\alpha : M_{S,\bar{s}} \to \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}$ is the canonical homomorphism. Then,

$$\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[Q]} \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[P] \simeq \mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}[X_1, \ldots, X_l, Y_1, \ldots, Y_r]/(X_1 \cdots X_l - t Y_1^{b_1} \cdots Y_r^{b_r}).$$

Therefore, f is moderate at x.

Next we consider the following proposition.

Proposition 7.1.3. *Let (A, tA) be a complete discrete valuation ring such that A/tA is algebraically closed. Let $f : X \to S = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ be a semistable scheme over S. We assume that $X \to S$ is moderate at any closed point of X. Let $\mu : Y \to X$ be a generically étale morphism over S such that μ is étale in the generic fiber and $f \circ \mu$ is smooth. Then, there is the canonical homomorphism $\mu^*(\omega_{X/S}) \to \omega_{Y/S}$.*

Proof. Let X_0 be the locus of points over which μ is étale. We set $Y_0 = \mu^{-1}(X_0)$. Then, there is the canonical homomorphism

$$\alpha_0 : \mu^*(\omega_{X_0/A}) \to \omega_{Y_0/A},$$

so that we need to show that α_0 extends to $\alpha : \mu^*(\omega_{X/A}) \to \omega_{Y/A}$. Note that the extension is uniquely determined if it exists.

Claim 7.1.3.1. *Let* $\{\pi_i : Y_i \to Y\}_i$ *be a family of étale morphisms with* $\operatorname{codim}(Y \setminus \bigcup_i \pi_i(Y_i)) \geq 2$. *If the assertion holds for each* $\mu \circ \pi_i : Y_i \to X$ *for all* i, *then so does for* $\mu : Y \to X$.

We assume that there is the canonical homomorphism

$$\alpha_i : (\mu \circ \pi_i)^*(\omega_{X/A}) \to \omega_{Y_i/A}.$$

for each i. Using the uniqueness of the extension and descent theory, we have $\alpha' : \mu^*(\omega_{X/A})\big|_{Y'} \to \omega_{Y/A}\big|_{Y'}$, where $Y' = \cup_i \pi_i(Y_i)$. Here Y is normal. Thus, we obtain the extension $\alpha : \mu^*(\omega_{X/A}) \to \omega_{Y/A}$.

By the above claim, we may assume that the central fiber of $f \circ \mu$ is irreducible. Let γ be the generic point of the central fiber. We set $\delta = \mu(\gamma)$. Let us choose a closed point $x \in \overline{\{\delta\}}$. Then there are a smooth A-algebra B and $T_1, \ldots, T_n, G \in B$ with the following properties:

1. $dT_1, \ldots, dT_n$ form a free basis of $\Omega_{B/A}$ and $G \in tB$.
2. There is an étale neighborhood $\pi : (U, x') \to X$ at x together with an étale morphism $\rho : U \to \operatorname{Spec}(B/(T_1 \cdots T_l - G))$.
3. $dG \in BdT_{l+1} + \cdots + BdT_n$.

Since $U \times_X Y$ is an étale neighborhood of γ, by the previous claim again, we may assume that $U = X$ and $x' = x$. Let s be a uniformizing parameter of a discrete valuation ring $\mathcal{O}_{Y,\gamma}$. Then, we can set $\mu^*(t_i) = s^{a_i} u_i$ ($u_i \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,\gamma}^{\times}$) for each $i = 1, \ldots, l$, where t_i is the class of T_i in B. Then, there is a Zariski open set V of $\overline{\{\gamma\}}$ such that $u_i \in \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}^{\times}$ for all $y \in V$ and all $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Let $c : \bigwedge^{n-1} \Omega^1_{U/A} \to \omega_{U/A}$ be the canonical homomorphism and ω_0 a basis of $\omega_{U/A}$ as in Lemma 5.2. Then, by using Lemma 5.2,

$$c(dt_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_n) = t_2 \cdots t_l \cdot \omega_0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\mu^*(dt_i) = s^{a_i} du_i$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Thus,

$$u_2 \cdots u_l \cdot \mu^*(dt_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_n) = \mu^*(t_2 \cdots t_l) \cdot du_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge du_l \wedge d\mu^*(t_{l+1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge d\mu^*(t_n).$$

Therefore,

$$\mu^*(\omega_0) = \frac{du_1}{u_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{du_l}{u_l} \wedge d\mu^*(t_{l+1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge d\mu^*(t_n)$$

on V. Thus, we get our proposition. □

Corollary 7.1.4. *Let* (A, tA) *be a discrete valuation ring and* $f : X \to S = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ *a semistable scheme over* S. *Let* M_X *and* M_S *be log structures of* X *and* S. *We assume that* f *extends to a smooth and integral homomorphism* $(X, M_X) \to (S, M_S)$. *Let* $\mu : Y \to X$ *be a generically étale morphism over* S *such that* μ *is étale on the generic fiber and* $f \circ \mu : Y \to S$ *is smooth. Then, there is the canonical homomorphism* $\mu^*(\omega_{X/S}) \to \omega_{Y/S}$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.3.1 and Remark 7.1.2, it is sufficient to see the following lemma. □

Lemma 7.1.5. *Let* $f : X \to S$ *and* $g : Y \to S$ *be semistable schemes over a locally noetherian scheme* S*, and* $\phi : X \to Y$ *be a morphism over* S*. Let* Y_0 *be the set of all points* $y \in Y$ *such that* g *is smooth at* y*, and let* $X_0 = \phi^{-1}(Y_0)$ *and* $\phi_0 = \phi|_{X_0}$*. Let* $\pi : S' \to S$ *be a faithfully flat and quasi-compact morphism of locally noetherian schemes. We set* $X' = X \times_S S'$*,* $X'_0 = X_0 \times_S S'$*,* $Y' = Y \times_S S'$*,* $Y'_0 = Y \times_S S'$ $\phi' = \phi \times_S \mathrm{id}_{S'}$ *and* $\phi'_0 = \phi'|_{X'_0}$*. If there is a homomorphism* $\phi'^*(\omega_{Y'/S'}) \to \omega_{X'/S'}$ *as an extension of the canonical homomorphism* ${\phi'_0}^*(\omega_{Y'_0/S'}) \to \omega_{X'_0/S'}$*, then it descents to* $\phi^*(\omega_{Y/S}) \to \omega_{X/S}$*.*

Proof. Note that if we have an extension $\phi^*(\omega_{Y/S}) \to \omega_{X/S}$ of the canonical homomorphism $\phi_0^*(\omega_{Y_0/S}) \to \omega_{X_0/S}$, then it is uniquely determined. Thus, our lemma is a consequence of the standard descent theory. □

7.2. **Semistable schemes of log canonical type and automorphisms.**

Let (A, tA) be a discrete valuation ring. Let $f : X \to \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ be a semistable scheme over A. We assume that f is generically smooth, that is, smooth over the generic point of $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$. Note that X is normal by using Serre's criterion. Let $\mu : Y \to X$ be a birational morphism of normal schemes over $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ such that $f \circ \mu$ is smooth over $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ and μ is an isomorphism on the generic fibers. Let Δ_μ be the set of irreducible components of the special fiber of $f \circ \mu$ such that $\overline{\mu(\Gamma)}$ has the codimension greater than or equal to 2 in X. Then, there is an integer a_Γ for each $\Gamma \in \Delta_\mu$ with

$$\omega_{Y/A} = \mu^*(\omega_{X/A}) + \sum_{\Gamma \in \Delta_\mu} a_\Gamma \Gamma.$$

This a_Γ is denoted by $d_\Gamma(\mu)$. Let B be an effective Cartier divisor on X. The pair (X, B) is said to be *of log canonical type* if, for any birational morphism $\mu : Y \to X$ of normal schemes over $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ such that $f \circ \mu$ is smooth over $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ and μ is an isomorphism on the generic fibers, $d_\Gamma(\mu) \geq \mathrm{ord}_\Gamma(\mu^*(B))$ for all $\Gamma \in \Delta_\mu$.

A moderate semistable scheme is of log canonical, namely, we have the following:

Proposition 7.2.1. *Let* $f : X \to \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ *be the same as above. If there is a local flat homomorphism* $(A, tA) \to (A', t'A')$ *of discrete valuation rings such that* $X \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(A)} \mathrm{Spec}(A') \to \mathrm{Spec}(A')$ *is moderate at any closed points, then* $(X, 0)$ *is of log canonical.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Proposition 7.1.3 and Lemma 7.1.5. □

Here we consider the following lemma.

Lemma 7.2.2. *Let* (A, tA) *be a discrete valuation ring. Let* $f : X \to \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ *and* $f' : X' \to \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ *be proper and generically smooth semistable schemes over* $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$*, and let* B *and* B' *be horizontal effective Cartier divisors on* X *and* X' *respectively. Let* $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ *be a birational map over* $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ *such that it is an isomorphism on the generic fibers* X_η *and* X'_η *and that* $\phi_\eta^*(B'_\eta) = B_\eta$*. Let* Y *be the normalization of the closure of the graph of* ϕ *and let* $\mu : Y \to X$ *and* $\mu' : Y \to X'$

be the canonical morphisms. We set $g = f \circ \mu = f' \circ \mu'$ *as the following diagram:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& Y \arrow[dl, "\mu"'] \arrow[dr, "\mu'"] \arrow[dd, "g"] & \\
X \arrow[rr, dotted, "\phi"] \arrow[dr, "f"'] & & X' \arrow[dl, "f'"] \\
& \operatorname{Spec}(R) &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let Δ *be the set of irreducible components of the special fiber of* g*. Let us set* Δ_0*,* Δ_1 *and* Δ_2 *as follows:*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_1 = \{\Gamma \in \Delta \mid \operatorname{codim}(\mu(\Gamma)) \geq 2\}, \\ \Delta_2 = \{\Gamma \in \Delta \mid \operatorname{codim}(\mu'(\Gamma)) \geq 2\}, \\ \Delta_0 = \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have the following:

(1) *If we set* $Y' = Y \setminus \bigcup_{\Gamma \in \Delta_0} \Gamma$*, then there is an open set* Y_0 *of* Y' *such that* $\operatorname{codim}(Y' \setminus Y_0) \geq 2$ *and* g *is smooth on* Y_0*.*

(2) *We assume the following:*

$$\begin{cases} d_\Gamma(\mu|_{Y_0}) \geq \operatorname{ord}_\Gamma((\mu|_{Y_0})^*(B)) & \forall\ \Gamma \in \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_0, \\ d_\Gamma(\mu'|_{Y_0}) \geq \operatorname{ord}_\Gamma((\mu'|_{Y_0})^*(B')) & \forall\ \Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0. \end{cases}$$

Then, the isomorphism

$$\phi_\eta^* : H^0(X'_\eta, n(\omega_{X'_\eta/K} + B'_\eta)) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(X_\eta, n(\omega_{X_\eta/K} + B_\eta))$$

on the generic fibers gives rise to the isomorphism

$$H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B))$$

for all $n > 0$*.*

Proof. (1) Let $\Gamma \in \Delta \setminus \Delta_0$ and γ the generic point of Γ. Then, by Zariski's main theorem, either μ or μ' is an isomorphism at γ. Therefore, g is smooth at γ. Thus, the assertion of (1) is obvious.

(2) For simplicity, $\mu|_{Y_0}$ and $\mu'|_{Y_0}$ are denoted by μ_0 and μ'_0 respectively. Let B_Y be the Zariski closure of $(\mu_0)_\eta^*(B_\eta) = (\mu'_0)_\eta^*(B'_\eta)$. Then,

$$\mu_0^*(B) = B_Y + \sum_{\Gamma \in \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_0} a_\Gamma \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad {\mu'}_0^*(B') = B_Y + \sum_{\Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0} a'_\Gamma \Gamma.$$

Moreover, we set

$$\omega_{Y_0/A} = \mu_0^*(\omega_{X/A}) + \sum_{\Gamma \in \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_0} b_\Gamma \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{Y_0/A} = {\mu'_0}^*(\omega_{X'/A}) + \sum_{\Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0} b'_\Gamma \Gamma.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} \omega_{Y_0/A} + B_Y = \mu_0^*(\omega_{X/A} + B) + \sum_{\Gamma \in \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_0} (a_\Gamma - b_\Gamma)\Gamma \\ \omega_{Y_0/A} + B_Y = {\mu'_0}^*(\omega_{X'/A} + B') + \sum_{\Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0} (a'_\Gamma - b'_\Gamma)\Gamma. \end{cases}$$

Note that $a_\Gamma - b_\Gamma \geq 0$ for $\Gamma \in \Delta_1 \setminus \Delta_0$ and $a'_\Gamma - b'_\Gamma \geq 0$ for $\Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0$. Therefore, we have the natural injection

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B)) &\hookrightarrow H^0(Y_0, n(\omega_{Y_0/A} + B_Y)) \\ &\hookrightarrow H^0\left(Y_0 \setminus \bigcup_{\Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0} \Gamma,\ n(\omega_{Y_0/A} + B_Y)\right) \\ &= H^0\left(Y_0 \setminus \bigcup_{\Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0} \Gamma,\ n{\mu'_0}^*(\omega_{X'/A} + B')\right) \end{aligned}$$

Here there are open sets U of $Y_0 \setminus \bigcup_{\Gamma \in \Delta_2 \setminus \Delta_0} \Gamma$ and V of X' such that μ'_0 induces the isomorphism $U \xrightarrow{\sim} V$ and $\operatorname{codim}(X' \setminus V) \geq 2$. Therefore, we obtain the injection

$$H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B)) \hookrightarrow H^0(V, n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')).$$

Moreover, since $\operatorname{codim}(X' \setminus V) \geq 2$, the natural map

$$H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')) \to H^0(V, n(\omega_{X'/A} + B'))$$

is an isomorphism. Hence, by the above observation, we can see that, for every $n > 0$, there is an injective homomorphism

$$\alpha : H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B)) \hookrightarrow H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B'))$$

such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd} H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B)) \arrow[r, hook, "\alpha"] \arrow[d, hook] & H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')) \arrow[d, hook] \\ H^0(X_\eta, n(\omega_{X_\eta/K} + B_\eta)) \arrow[r, "\sim", "(\phi_\eta^{-1})^*"'] & H^0(X'_\eta, n(\omega_{X'_\eta/K} + B'_\eta)). \end{tikzcd}$$

In the same way, we have also an injective homomorphism

$$\beta : H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')) \hookrightarrow H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B))$$

for all $n > 0$ with the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd} H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')) \arrow[r, hook, "\beta"] \arrow[d, hook] & H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B)) \arrow[d, hook] \\ H^0(X'_\eta, n(\omega_{X'_\eta/K} + B'_\eta)) \arrow[r, "\sim", "(\phi_\eta)^*"'] & H^0(X_\eta, n(\omega_{X_\eta/K} + B_\eta)). \end{tikzcd}$$

Thus, for $\lambda \in H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B))$, λ and $\beta(\alpha(\lambda))$ gives rise to the same element in $H^0(X_\eta, n(\omega_{X_\eta/K} + B_\eta))$. Therefore, $\lambda = \beta \circ \alpha(\lambda)$, which means $\beta \circ \alpha = \mathrm{id}$. In the same way, we can see that $\alpha \circ \beta = \mathrm{id}$. Hence, we get our assertion. □

Theorem 7.2.3. *Let (A, tA) be a discrete valuation ring, $f : X \to \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ and $f' : X' \to \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ proper and generically smooth semistable schemes over $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$, and B and B' horizontal effective Cartier divisors on X and X' respectively. Let $\phi : X \dashrightarrow X'$ be a birational map over $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$ such that it is an isomorphism on the generic fibers X_η and X'_η and that $\phi_\eta^*(B'_\eta) = B_\eta$. We assume that (X, B) and (X', B') are of log canonical type. Then, we have the following:*

(1) *Then, for all $n > 0$, there is the isomorphism*

$$\phi^* : H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B))$$

such that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')) \arrow[r, "\sim", "\phi^*"'] \arrow[d, hook] & H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B)) \arrow[d, hook] \\
H^0(X'_\eta, n(\omega_{X'_\eta/K} + B'_\eta)) \arrow[r, "\sim", "(\phi_\eta)^*"'] & H^0(X_\eta, n(\omega_{X_\eta/K} + B_\eta)).
\end{tikzcd}$$

(2) *If $\omega_{X/A} + B$ and $\omega_{X'/A} + B'$ are ample with respect to f and f', then ϕ extends to an isomorphism.*

Proof. (1) is an immediate corollary of Lemma 7.2.2. Let us consider (2). Since $\omega_{X/A} + B$ and $\omega_{X'/A} + B'$ are ample, there is a positive integer n such that $n(\omega_{X/A} + B)$ and $n(\omega_{X'/A} + B')$ are very ample. Moreover, by (1), we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, dotted, "\phi"] & \operatorname{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{m\geq 0} \operatorname{Sym}^m(H^0(X, n(\omega_{X/A} + B))^\vee)\right) \arrow[d, "(\phi^*)^\vee"', "\wr"] \\
X' \arrow[r, hook] & \operatorname{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{m\geq 0} \operatorname{Sym}^m(H^0(X', n(\omega_{X'/A} + B'))^\vee)\right).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Thus, ϕ must be an isomorphism. □

References

[1] M. Artin: Algebraic approximation of structures over complete local rings, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. 36(1969), 23-58.

[2] S. Chase, Direct products of modules, Trans. AMS. 97 (1960), 457–473.

[3] A. Altman and S. Kleiman, Introduction to Grothendieck Duality Theorem, LNM 146, Springer-Verlag.

[4] P. Deligne and D. Mumford, The irreducibility of the space of curves of given genus, Publ. Math. IHES, 36 (1969), 75–110.

[5] K. Kato, Logarithmic structure of Fontaine-Illusie, Algebraic analysis, geometry, and number theory (Baltimore, MD, 1988), 191–224, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 1989.

[6] I. Iwanari and A. Moriwaki, Dominant rational maps in the category of log schemes, preprint.

[7] Q. Liu, Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves, Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No.6, Oxford Univ. Press.

[8] H. Matsumura, Commutative ring theory, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 8.

[9] A. Moriwaki, The continuity of Deligne's pairing, IMRN, No. 19 (1999).

[10] A. Ogus, Logarithmic De Rham cohomology, preprint (1997).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO, 606-8502, JAPAN

E-mail address: `moriwaki@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`